

DCV

THE SATURDAY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 841, Vol. 32.

December 9, 1871.

[Registered for
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

PRESIDENT GRANT'S MESSAGE.

THE PRESIDENT's Message to the forty-second Congress in its second Session is, as far as its character can be ascertained from the telegraphic summary, with good reason cheerful and congratulatory. Even the disasters which have lately befallen Chicago and other North-western cities have produced some moral compensation in the practical sympathy which has been evoked both within the States and in foreign countries. The Union, as a whole, enjoys uninterrupted prosperity, although grave exceptions to the general welfare are presented by many parts of the South. It is well known that the ravages of the war and of the social revolution by which it was accompanied have still to be effaced; and the lawless proceedings of armed bands which assume various fantastic names represent widespread dissatisfaction; but perhaps it would be useless to discuss evil results of past errors which can only be corrected by time. The corrupt Northern adventurers who after the war, and during the disfranchisement of the better part of the community, acquired local power by the support of the negroes, have every day to deal with increasing numbers of a new generation which cannot be excluded from a share in political action. It has been justly remarked that the Republican party, and the PRESIDENT as their probable candidate, are lucky in the occurrence of the outrages which tend to divert attention from the settlement in every Southern State of a little colony of Republican TWEEDS and SWEENYS. The census of last year shows a considerable increase of population notwithstanding the loss of life during the war and the interruption of prosperity. If the Southern States were excluded from consideration, the material progress of the remainder of the Union would be still more remarkable. The PRESIDENT and his advisers, being innocent of any knowledge of political economy, have not recognised the errors which have been committed in commercial legislation and in fiscal policy; and fortunately for those whose affairs they administer, America can afford better than any other country to commit economic blunders. The SECRETARY of the TREASURY is naturally satisfied with his own operations when he finds that he is able in every successive year to pay off several millions of debt. It is a pleasant and easy task to strike a balance when the revenue steadily exceeds the expenditure, and when constantly diminishing burdens are imposed on a body of taxpayers who are rapidly advancing both in numbers and in wealth. During the present Session Congress will be able to effect a considerable reduction of taxes, and at the same time to provide for the continued discharge of the debt. Before the date of another census the pressure of the debt will have become insignificant, if only peace is preserved.

In the friendly relations of the United States with all foreign nations the PRESIDENT expresses entire confidence. Even his odd ebullition of anger against the Russian Minister has a bearing exclusively personal. It might have been supposed that the Congress and people of the United States would have troubled themselves little with Mr. CATACAZY's eccentricities, since he has been withdrawn from his official position; but perhaps the PRESIDENT thought it necessary to remove any doubt which might have been entertained of the continuance of his amicable feelings to Russia. The Americans have always prided themselves on the sympathy which they suppose to exist between the great European despotism and their own Republic. It is true that their affection for Russia always became more conspicuous with every increase of irritation against England; and that even in the present year their solicitude for the creation of a Russian fleet in the Black Sea perceptibly subsided as soon as they had received full and unexpected satisfaction for their *Alabama*

demands. There is some obscurity, produced perhaps by telegraphic compression, in the statement that the German EMPEROR desires to act in harmony with the moderate and just policy which the United States maintain with Asiatic Powers and South American Republics. It is not understood that the relations between Germany and Peru or Guatemala are either close or important; and the only Asiatic Power with which the Government of Washington has any known dealings is the Empire of China. It was a matter of course that the American Government should recognise the removal of the Italian capital to Rome; and it seems that, by a treaty recently concluded, the United States and Italy have agreed that, in the improbable contingency of war between them, private property at sea shall be exempted from capture. The PRESIDENT adds that the United States have omitted no opportunity of incorporating the rule among the obligations of nations; yet in 1856 the American Government deliberately withdrew a proposal for the exemption of private property, as soon as it was understood that Lord PALMERSTON was disposed to accept the offer. Whatever may be the merits of the plan, it is impossible that it can be embodied in a more innocuous and inoperative shape than in an agreement between two remote communities which can scarcely by possibility be involved in a quarrel.

The author of the *Alabama* Treaty is fully justified in regarding his work both with personal and with patriotic complacency. General GRANT had the sagacity to perceive that the English proposal for a Conference on the Canadian dispute indicated a desire to receive overtures for the settlement of all existing differences. His suggestion that the *Alabama* question should be simultaneously considered was judiciously timed, inasmuch as it was proper that the negotiation should, after the rejection of the REVERDY JOHNSON Treaty by the Senate, be formally reopened by the American Government. It is probable that on this point, as on others, English exigencies would not have proved insuperable; but the PRESIDENT sacrificed nothing by the avoidance of an unnecessarily discourteous proceeding. The Commissioners who were appointed to conduct the discussions were men of the highest character and capacity; and it soon appeared that they only required the most simple instructions. With one exception they were to insist on all demands which had at any time been preferred, and they were not to admit any counter proposal, however just, which might be advanced by their English colleagues. American jurists had conclusively exposed the absurdity of Mr. SUMNER's complaint that a state of war undeniably existing at the time, and formally recognised by the American Courts, had also been officially noticed by the English Government of 1861. Since that time President GRANT himself had taken occasion, in reference to Cuba, to repudiate all claim on the part of any foreign Power to interfere with the discretionary recognition of belligerent rights. Mr. REVERDY JOHNSON, in a pamphlet lately published, has endeavoured to prove that his own treaty, which would in fact have been sufficiently humiliating to England, would have afforded to the United States ample satisfaction than the recent settlement; but, although the vague terms of the documents to which Lord STANLEY and Lord CLARENCE consented might possibly have enabled the American diplomats to bring the QUEEN's Proclamation before the arbitrator, it was evident that any pretension of the kind would have been summarily rejected. On the other hand, Mr. REVERDY JOHNSON had never ventured to insist on a comprehensive apology for acts which, according to the awkward protest of the English Commissioners, were, as they truly stated, not inconsistent with national duty. The retrospective application of a rule of law confessedly novel could scarcely have been deemed allowable when the negotiation was first renewed at Washington; but the

English Commission exercised no discretion of its own, inasmuch as the English Government was fully determined to obtain the settlement of the question at any cost. When the American Commissioners declined to entertain a just claim for compensation on account of the Fenian invasions of Canada, it was thought a sufficient apology for the application of different measures to the respective acts of the two Governments that neither the PRESIDENT nor the people would consent to refer the claim to arbitration. To Englishmen jealous for what may remain of the honour of their country it is not agreeable to read idle boasts, addressed by members to their constituents, of the opening of a new era of peace and justice by the submission to a judicial tribunal of a great national controversy. It must be again repeated, that the American Commissioners expressly refuse to submit to arbitration the first English claim which has been presented against the United States. The reference of their own claim was merely a decorous method of securing the satisfaction which they had from the first demanded. No treaty would have been concluded at Washington if the English Government had not been ready to surrender, for the sake of peace, every point in dispute. On such terms reference to arbitration would be the easiest possible termination of a quarrel, though it would, as in the present case, be superfluous to appoint an arbitrator, except for the purpose of assessing damages. If, contrary to probability and to the intentions of both the contracting Governments, the arbitrators were even now to decide that England was not responsible for the depredations of the *Alabama*, the indignation of the American people would revive with additional fierceness. One of the ablest, and in other matters one of the most temperate, of American journalists lately announced that a certain class of English claims would, in spite of the treaty, never be recognised by the American people, although he admitted that they might perhaps be legally established. As the Americans have for the most part accepted the English submission in a gracious, and as far as possible in an inoffensive, spirit, it would now be a cause for regret that any impediment should arise to a final settlement. There is a story that the Knights of St. JOHN made so hurried a surrender of their great fortress Valetta that the French garrison, in default of guidance, had some difficulty in finding their way into the works. The English Government have for the sake of conciliation abandoned all their legal defences, and they have even opened new legal modes of access into their position; but it is barely possible that the arbitrators may be more difficult to satisfy than the Commissioners and those from whom they received their instructions. It becomes Englishmen to say as little as possible about a transaction which will not be rendered more creditable or more dignified by subsequent bluster. The American PRESIDENT is fully entitled to celebrate in becoming language the great triumph which he has achieved for his fellow-citizens. A year ago his Message sounded like a declaration of war. The change of tone which has succeeded corresponds to the transformation into a beautiful woman of the menacing sorceress who was only restored to her natural form when, in the words of the ballad, she met with a courteous knight who would let her have all her will.

THE OPENING OF THE FRENCH ASSEMBLY.

M. THIERS'S Message is the production of a man who is or affects to be exceedingly well satisfied with himself and his work. He evidently expects to carry the Assembly with him as regards the two measures he has most at heart—the reimposition of protective duties and the maintenance of the existing military system. The Government are resolved, he says, to get rid of the Commercial Treaty with England in its present form, and they are convinced that the adoption of the German method of recruiting would be the destruction of France. Considering how nearly France has been "lost" under a system which in theory is identical with that on which M. THIERS proposes to rely for the future, some further arguments might have been brought forward in support of this statement. That civil life would be disorganized, and the finances of the country ruined, by the extension of compulsory service to the whole population requires to be proved as well as asserted after a war in which the power that has especially associated itself with this principle has achieved such splendid successes at so apparently trifling a cost. The meaning of M. THIERS's determination will be variously interpreted. It may be due to a traditional belief in the military excellence of the French system, coupled with a disposition to lay all its recent shortcomings at the door of the Empire; or it may spring from unwillingness to leave France in the power-

less condition to which a country is necessarily reduced while changing the form and character of its army. One obvious consequence, however, it can hardly fail to have. The conscription will still be unpopular; the aim and desire of the 90,000 young men who are annually to be draughted into active service will, as now, be to escape the unlucky lots, and to see the privilege of defending France devolve upon other shoulders. This part of M. THIERS's Message seems to have been received with much disapprobation, and it is not impossible that the Republican party may make it the occasion of their first trial of strength with the Government. Universal service is a good text for expressions of patriotic resolution to raise France to her former pitch of greatness, and the desire to escape the known evils of the conscription may incline the peasantry towards an alternative which at all events would make the burden lighter for those who now have to bear it.

The telegraphic summary of the Message says that it makes no allusion to the constitutional question. But it appears from the account which the *Times*' Correspondent sends of its reception by the Assembly, that a very significant reference to this subject was introduced just before the end. The PRESIDENT told the Assembly "that it has the sovereign right to decide on the definitive form of government, and advised it not to take an '*initiative précipitée*.'" It is clear from this last phrase that M. THIERS has no present intention of departing from the Bordeaux compact. His theory as to the position of the Assembly remains what it was. To hold the judgment in suspense for any considerable time has been called one of the hardest of intellectual feats, and it will not be wonderful if the French Assembly finds a similar difficulty in abstaining from constitutional experiments during the Session which has just opened. Legislation seems the natural business of a Legislature. Certainly no one would wish to condemn the Assembly to absolute inaction in this respect. There is work in abundance that needs to be done, if the Deputies would only consent to limit their energy to really necessary labours. But the strength of resolution which such conduct would imply is not often to be met with. Men who have the credit of being competent to deal with subjects of the highest commercial and social importance, who were summoned in the first instance to choose between peace and war, and were afterwards permitted to reorganize the local administration of the country, may be excused if they think themselves competent to settle whether France shall be a Monarchy or a Republic. Yet it is of as much moment to-day as it was in the spring that this great issue should be postponed to a more convenient season. It may be true that in the nature of things there is no difference between one chapter of a proposed Constitution and another, that law-making is equally a sovereign act whatever be its subject-matter, and that if the Assembly is a valid Legislature for one purpose it is a valid Legislature for all others. But this justification of an active exercise of constituent powers is purely technical. It leaves out of sight the fact that it is only so long as the Assembly abstains from going beyond the purpose for which it was elected that it has any right to call itself the representative of the French nation. When the elections were held, the one question before the constituencies was how to deal with the Germans; whether to make peace with them on their own conditions, or to go on fighting with them at all costs. The majority of the electors had a perfectly clear idea of their own wishes in this respect. They wanted peace, and they took care to send up Deputies who would insist upon having peace. It was never suggested to them that they should mix up with this issue the further question under what form of government Frenchmen were henceforward to live. So long as a candidate declared himself anxious to come to terms with the enemy, and to give the country breathing-time to estimate the extent of its misfortunes, he was sufficiently acceptable to the bulk of the voters. It is true that this requirement excluded Republicans of the GAMBETTA type, since the ex-Dictator had made it clear from the first that his desire was to continue the war. But with this exception, the Deputies were an indistinguishable mass of all opinions, Legitimists, Bonapartists, Orleanists, moderate Republicans, agreeing on the one point they had immediately to decide, and agreeing also in giving that general support to M. THIERS which the nation—as shown by the fact of his election in so many districts—unmistakably wished him to receive. In what proportions these several parties would have been distributed over the Assembly had the elections turned upon any distinct Constitutional issue, it is impossible to say. Competent observers differed upon this point then, and differ upon it still, and the same observer has not

always taken the same view. So far, therefore, there is reason in the cry for a dissolution, or rather there would be reason in it supposing the Assembly were to become constituent in act as well as in pretension. Provided, however, that the Assembly continues to maintain the reserve which characterized it throughout the greater part of last Session, there is nothing to indicate that the constituencies are dissatisfied with their representatives, or have any wish to hurry on a general election. The uncertainty as to the ultimate form of the government which so largely prevails in the Assembly has its counterpart out of doors. When M. THIERS told the Deputies last February that they were united so long as they confined themselves to social and material reorganization, but divided so soon as they wandered off to political reconstruction, he described the position of the country as well as of the Chamber. The form of government cannot at present be definitively fixed without risking a civil war; and considering how lately the Communist insurrection has been put down, how much ill-blood has been stored up in the process, and how near the Germans still are to Paris, it would be hardly decent to decide the quarrel by such means.

These are the counsels of prudence, but it seems far from certain that they are counsels to which the Assembly will be disposed to listen. The *Times*' Correspondent reports that the majority have come back to Versailles more anti-Repub-lican than ever. "They have found the country tending rapidly in the opposite sense, and the result has been not to incline them to go with it, but to frighten them into a vigorous resistance." The danger, therefore, is that the Assembly will insist on taking up the question of the form of government with a view to deciding it in favour of monarchy. The only course which would then be open to M. THIERS, supposing him to retain his original conviction of the fatal impolicy of such a step, would be to call on the nation to show, in some informal but unmistakable way, its determination not to accept any Constitution framed by the existing Assembly. M. THIERS must by this time be aware of the mistake he made in not insisting on the right to dissolve as an absolute condition of his undertaking the Government. To obtain this right from the Assembly now would be a difficult matter; but it is possible that he might succeed if judicious pressure on this point were accompanied by judicious concessions as regards the admission of the ORLEANS princes to seats in the Chamber. There is no reason for excluding them any longer, and their presence in the Assembly might even tend, by gratifying the monarchical sentiment of the Deputies, to moderate their monarchical zeal. And, apart from this, the power of dissolving the Assembly would be so invaluable to M. THIERS in view of coming controversies, that it would be worth purchasing at almost any cost.

MAHOMEDANS IN INDIA.

A NEW contribution to the literature of Mahomedan casuistry has been made by the publication of a Report of a Mahomedan Literary Society which met at Calcutta about a year ago to consider a response of certain Mahomedan doctors on the vexed question whether devout Mahomedans in India are bound to wage war against an infidel Government. The answer that had been given was, in the opinion of the leaders of the Literary Society, a wrong one. It pointed to the right conclusion that Mahomedans have no warlike duties as against the Indian Government, but it did so on wrong grounds, and the criticism evoked by this mistake had the merit of placing the true nature of the duties of devout Mahomedans towards the Indian Government in the clearest possible light. Every country is, in Mahomedan eyes, a country of peace or a country of enmity. If a country is a country of enmity, then a good Mahomedan who sees a fair chance of its being subdued is bound to aid in making war on it. But if a country is or has been a country of peace, it does not cease to be so unless several conditions are fulfilled, one of which is that no Moslem is found in the enjoyment of religious liberty in it. India was once a country of peace, for it was under Mahomedan rulers; and it has never ceased to be so, for all Mahomedans enjoy perfect religious liberty in it, and have always done so since it passed under British rule. The mistake made by the doctors to criticize whom was the object of the Literary Society was that they assumed that they were consulted as to the duties of Mahomedans sojourning in a country of enmity; and they replied that, by placing themselves under the protection of an infidel Power, Mahomedans had entered into a tacit covenant not to make war against it, and that war can in no case be a duty unless it promises

to be successful. This was a tranquillizing answer, but it was not the right one. The proper answer was that, if it was India that was spoken of, the question as to the duty of making war could not arise; for India is a country of peace, and no Mahomedan has any religious duties at all against the Government of a country of peace. This was the doctrinal side of the discussion of the Literary Society, and the conclusion is a satisfactory and intelligible one; and, if it is practically accepted by Mahomedans in India, it is more reassuring than the doctrine that devout Mahomedans must wait to make war on us until they have a really good chance of hurting us. A formula such as that they are living in a country of peace is the readiest means of checking in the bud the conscientious scruples of martial Mahomedans. One of the dearest delights of the heart of man is to talk safe treason; and many Mahomedans might take pleasure in discussing the theoretical question whether at any given time the British Government was not getting weak enough to excite the beginnings of religious uneasiness in pious breasts. But safe treason is apt to lead on to unsafe treason; and it is as advantageous to the Mahomedans as to the English that all such discussions should be capable of being terminated by a reference to the formula that India is a country of peace, and that therefore a religious war against its Government is out of the question.

But the meeting of this Literary Society showed that it was not only the comforting sense of orthodoxy that attached those present, and the section of the Mahomedan world in whose name they spoke, to British rule. There was a tie of feeling as well as of doctrinal interpretation that bound them to the Government of the English. The SULTAN is the temporal head of their faith, and England is the best and firmest ally of the SULTAN. How could it be the duty of believers to initiate a holy war against a nation which was not only very strong, but used its strength to support the head of the Faith? The leaders of the Society spoke of England as the friends of the POPE speak of France. England is, as it were, the eldest daughter of the Mahomedan Church. It is England who fights for, guards, counsels, and helps the chosen keeper of Mecca and Medina. Possibly this is a view of the subject that is not familiar to many Englishmen. We are the blessed and appointed protectors of the sublime Lord of the true believers. We are always ready to come down to Mahomedan Mentanas with our DE FAILLYS and our Chassepots. We even do what may be termed the odd jobs of the earthly representative of the great Prophet. The sitting of the Literary Society was honoured and cheered by the accidental presence of a wandering patriarch, who announced that he had travelled in many countries and had been twice to Constantinople. He lived at Medina, and was a descendant of one of the Companions of the Prophet. This venerable person was able from his own autobiographical recollections to illustrate the ingratitude that would be involved in even the remotest thought of warring against England. He was in Egypt when the firman of the SULTAN arrived bidding the VICEROY acknowledge the supremacy of his master. The VICEROY hesitated, when the British Consul-General informed him that he had orders to telegraph to Athens for the British fleet unless instant submission was shown. The VICEROY bowed his head, and thus, by the intervention of the great guardian of Islamism, all danger of a painful rupture was averted. And what was especially delightful was, that the VICEROY was subsequently on the very best terms with those who had thus, if in somewhat an austere manner, guided him in the right path. As one eloquent speaker justly said, "Does it become the province of Islam to 'wage war against a nation ever ready to help the Mahomedans whenever and wherever there should be occasion for it?" And he answered his own question by adding, "Oh, no—such a thing can never become the dignity of Islam."

We have no doubt that the exposition of the duties of Mahomedans in India as regards a religious war thus offered by the Literary Society is either the true doctrine, or is so like the true doctrine that it comes to the same thing, although we confess that the shrewd patience and guarded forethought of the orthodox Mahomedan of the present day who is to wait to make war until the probability of winning is demonstrated to him, seems rather far off from the fatalistic enthusiasm of the fiery companions and successors of the Prophet. It is also probable that the alliance between England and Turkey may appeal a little to the gratitude and much to the hopes of the few among the faithful in India who have the slightest notion of what happens at a distance. In quiet times it fortifies the upholders of peace and order that views so favourable to English rule should be promulgated by a re-

spectable body of Mahomedans at Calcutta. But the members of this Society are so respectable that they frighten us lest they should be too respectable to represent any considerable section of Mahomedan opinion. They speak of the Wahabees as Dr. JOHNSON spoke of Scotchmen and Dissenters. They dwell much on the argument that it cannot be wrong for good Mahomedans to acquiesce in the rule of the English, because to uphold the contrary would be to impugn the devotion of so many excellent people. Even some of the statements which they are good enough to make in our favour suggest an apprehension lest they should seem to themselves to have overpraised us. At this meeting an official announced, as the latest news, that Russia had broken faith with the SULTAN and wanted Russian ships of war to frequent the Black Sea once more; but that England, having secured the alliance of Italy and Austria, had proudly and firmly forbidden that the SULTAN should be thus menaced and disgraced. We could wish our zealous Mahomedan friends were a little less positive in their assurance as to what they are going to owe to England. When, again, we read that a Christian rule may be the more readily acquiesced in because the Prophet himself said that his followers should be inclined to hope for the conversion of Christians, seeing that they had priests and monks and had no pride about them, we feel that a more inaccurate description of the English Christians who happen to rule in India could not be given. Perhaps the truth is that, as happens in every clime and age and with every race and caste, we seem good to Indian Mahomedans because we are successful; and if we fall on days of adversity, we should find little strength either in the comforting doctrine of the country of peace or in our long services to the "Servant of the two holy cities of Mecca and Medina." But, as things are at present, the opinions on which we have been commenting undoubtedly corroborate the belief entertained by all the best judges of Indian affairs, that we are in no real danger of a purely Mahomedan rising, apart from general native disaffection or from some vast change in circumstances that might promise all who are disaffected in India a satisfactory chance of driving away for ever the rude foreigners who insist on introducing into an Asiatic society the alien notions of order, justice, and systematic taxation.

GERMANY AND FRANCE.

TO no one will the Message of M. THIERS be more interesting than to Prince BISMARCK. It is the province of M. THIERS to determine so far as he can what shall be the immediate future of France, and Germany is much concerned to know how France will be governed, and what will be her political, military, and financial condition during the next two years and a half. There are three things more especially as to which Prince BISMARCK will desire to be able to form a correct estimate. He will examine the PRESIDENT's Message with a wish to ascertain whether France will be able to pay the indemnity in the time fixed, whether she is bent on a policy of immediate revenge, and what are to be the relations of the German forces and the French population in the occupied districts. On all three heads the Message is studiously framed so as to be reassuring and tranquillizing to Germany. But there is much in it to cause anxiety to German statesmen, except on the last head. The French population hate the Germans with the most intense hatred, and it is only natural they should do so. The presence of the eternal foreigners with their spiked helmets calmly lounging in the railway stations of important French towns strikes even strangers as something that is hardly to be borne by the most patient population; and the French are not only a very impatient people, but the sense of mortification and humiliation caused by the spectacle of their conquerors meeting them in every walk of daily life must be far greater than what casual spectators can realize. The consequence is that many German soldiers have been murdered. The German Government could not tolerate this, but they were recently content that the experiment should be tried whether, if the murderers were left to be dealt with in the ordinary course of French justice, satisfaction might not be given in a manner which would show that Frenchmen acknowledged the guilt of assassination, and would relieve the conquerors of seeming to carry everything with the high hand of military force. The experiment totally failed. A Frenchman killed a Prussian soldier with his knife in the street, and the only shadow of defence urged was that the German called him a pig and that the Frenchman was drunk. But the advocate of the murderer discarded all such petty grounds of defence, and took the bold line of de-

claring openly that no French jury could think of pronouncing guilty of murder a man who had committed the patriotic act of killing a German. It was in vain that the official prosecutor warned the jury that the doctrine thus upheld would bring French justice into collision with a power far stronger than French justice and French juries and France itself. The jury brought in a verdict of Not Guilty, and the German authorities replied by simply issuing an order that in future Frenchmen accused of murdering German soldiers would be tried by German courts-martial. Two Frenchmen were so tried a few days ago and were shot. No one can doubt that the German Government is right in protecting, even in this arbitrary and summary way, the lives of its soldiers. No German soldier in a French town would count his life worth a day's purchase unless the French knew that, if a German was attacked or killed, instantaneous and inevitable punishment would await the offender. But the PRESIDENT could not forget the daily provocations and humiliations to which the excitable population of the occupied towns is subjected. He has accordingly made, as his Message states that he has made, the best arrangement the matter admitted of. He does not complain that the Germans should take care that their soldiers are not murdered with impunity. He disavows the dangerous doctrine of the too zealous advocate, and reminds his countrymen that the life of a foreigner is as much to be respected as the life of a Frenchman. But he has induced the Germans to agree that their troops shall be as much as possible kept in barracks. The irritation of the presence of the occupying forces will thus be diminished as much as possible, while, if Frenchmen choose henceforth to show their patriotism by assassination, they will know that a German court-martial will instantly make them answer for their crime.

That France means to pay the indemnity is beyond all question, and that she can in some way or other find the money is almost as certain. Prince BISMARCK knew this before he read the Message, and he knows so much and no more now. If he gets paid, he has nothing whatever to do with the mode in which the money is raised, or with the miseries caused hereafter by the taxation which its payment will involve. But he is far too cautious a man to make sure too soon that all will go right. The real danger is that, before the final instalment of the indemnity is paid in 1874, there may either be such a state of things in France that the Government of the day will be unable to raise the money, or that there may be so much disorder that Germany will forcibly interfere to secure payment of what is due. It is quite true that the anxiety to get the Germans finally out of France affords the strongest possible motive to all Frenchmen so to conduct their own affairs that the money due to Germany may be punctually forthcoming. But even those who are most anxious to see the bright side of French affairs must see that there is a gloomy side too. M. THIERS states that the annual sum henceforth necessary to be raised in France will be one hundred and ten millions sterling, as against sixty millions twenty years ago. A great portion of this increase is no doubt due to the Empire, apart from the ruinous war with which the Empire terminated. A French politician might perhaps usefully inveigh against a system which has cost his country so much. But a German statesman has nothing to do with this. Fifty millions sterling more have to be raised somehow, and the world outside and inside France has to be convinced that they will be raised regularly, or the money necessary for the indemnity will not be lent. The Empire increased the burdens of France, but it also greatly augmented its resources. Free trade and internal security made France every day richer. French enterprise and French commerce kept every day growing. What is now the programme of M. THIERS, in order to raise more than twice as much taxation as the EMPEROR had to raise? It is to maintain all the essential features of the Empire, its vast military expenditure, its centralization, its repression of popular education in deference to the priests, without Free trade. The Empire with Protection, but without anything like the same assurance of internal tranquillity, is virtually to be made to do twice as much financially for France as the Empire with Free trade did. Why should any one, whether he is a German or not, think this at all likely to succeed? And the purely financial part of the PRESIDENT's Message is by no means all of it that has to do with finance. It is marked throughout with the impress of a mind which sees dangers on every side, and seeks safety only in waiting upon events. If M. THIERS is not confident about France, Prince BISMARCK is not likely to be more confident; and there can be little

doubt that, if there were any serious troubles in France, time—probably a considerable time—must elapse before there would be a Government sufficiently stable to raise a large loan on terms not positively ruinous. Germany might still get her money—not in 1874 perhaps, but a year or two later. But this protraction of the painful relations of the two countries would be dangerous to both, and its possibility must be a cause of serious apprehension to all the statesmen of the German Empire.

M. THIERS talks of nothing but peace. France is pledged, he says, to peace; and France will keep her word. The attitude of all other nations encourages her in this good disposition. She is even on very fairly good terms with Germany. She abhors all thoughts of interfering anywhere. On the best possible footing with Italy, she at the same time so heartily respects the independence of the Pope that she will not even give him any advice. There is not a single sentence in the description of the foreign policy of France at which the most sensitive German could take umbrage or alarm. Nevertheless it must occur to any reflecting German that, although M. THIERS may be perfectly sincere in his desire for peace, he is at the same time doing all that a prudent man who hopes some day before long to renew the war could do at this moment. Before France can hope to fight Germany again with the remotest prospect of success, she must build up three things. She must build up a new, large, and effective army; she must fortify her frontier towards Germany, so as not to be crushed before she can strike a blow; and she must secure the assistance of some ally who will divide the forces of Germany. What does M. THIERS propose? He asks to be allowed to create a vast French army 800,000 strong by large levies of conscripts, and to make every Frenchman liable to service in time of war. He asks for a considerable sum to strengthen the frontier defences; and lastly, he announces, with peculiar emphasis and satisfaction, that the most cordial relations exist between Russia and France. He is polite and friendly to Austria, and also, in spite of the ecclesiastical leanings of a large portion of the Assembly, he is polite and friendly to Italy. No French statesman will wish, if he has any sense, to make either of these Powers take refuge during the next few years in the open protection of Germany. To keep Austria and Italy friendly but neutral, and to get up an intimate and, in time perhaps, an offensive alliance with Russia, will be the aim of every successive French Government. Germany is perfectly aware of this, and the significance of the PRESIDENT's reference to Russia will be perfectly apparent to Prince BISMARCK. Nor can any nation in Europe pretend to be indifferent to the consequences to which it points. Even the celebrated streak of silver sea could scarcely save us from feeling pressing danger brought home to us if a coalition of France and Russia threatened Germany, and through Germany some of our greatest interests in the East.

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE AND MR. GLADSTONE.

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE exercised a sound discretion in publishing his correspondence with Mr. GLADSTONE and the LORD CHANCELLOR. It would have been undesirable that the sycophants of the PRIME MINISTER should have the opportunity of hinting that the remonstrance was suggested either by personal ill-will to Sir ROBERT COLLIER or by any doubt of his professional qualifications. It is now agreed on all hands that the late ATTORNEY-GENERAL is well fitted for the office to which he has been irregularly appointed; and those who are responsible for the evasion of the law will not be able to escape censure, although it may be impossible either to annul the transaction or to punish their conduct. The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE expresses a doubt whether a colourable compliance with the statute is legally sufficient, nor is it possible to dispute his statement that the Judges of his own Court would have used strong language to any person who might have perpetrated a similar trick in the appointment of an alderman or town councillor. It is fortunately not probable that the question of Sir R. COLLIER's eligibility will be raised before any tribunal, and probably his successive patents, and the fact that he actually took his seat on the bench of the Common Pleas, would be regarded as conclusive. The two functionaries who have incurred Sir A. COCKBURN's just reproof are both austere and eminent moralists. In any case but their own they might perhaps think that it was not the business of Prime Ministers and Chancellors to offer conspicuous examples of the impunity which sometimes attends indirect dealings.

If Lord PALMERSTON or Lord LYNDHURST had for their own purposes tampered with the spirit of the law, it is easy to imagine the contemptuous reprobation with which political publicans would have been visited by any Pharisees who might have been found among their colleagues or opponents. It is often observed in private life that conscious excellence supersedes the necessity of a too minute regard for minor scruples. The Bench, the Bar, and the entire community, are in the present case of one opinion; but they make no allowance for the moral infallibility of Sir A. COCKBURN'S correspondents.

The CHIEF JUSTICE, having mislaid Mr. GLADSTONE's answer to his letter, states, not without a humorous meaning, that he can "trust his own memory for the *ipsissima verba* in which it was expressed." It would perhaps be too much to say that a careful student of Mr. GLADSTONE's intellectual manner might have reproduced the missing document by conjecture; but it may be confidently asserted that if the authority of the CHIEF JUSTICE were not sufficient, the style and the argument, as lawyers say of the seals of certain deeds, prove themselves. The objection which had been raised was neither to the nomination of Sir R. COLLIER to be a Judge of the Court of Common Pleas, nor to the promotion of one of the Common Law Judges to a seat on the Judicial Committee of Privy Council. The alleged impropriety consisted in the process of "investing a party, otherwise not qualified, with a qualifying office, not that he shall hold the latter, but that he may be immediately transferred to the former." Mr. GLADSTONE replies that "the transaction is a joint one, and that, as the completed part of it is the act of the LORD CHANCELLOR," he has referred Sir A. COCKBURN's letter to him. It is true that the patronage of the Common Law Bench is ordinarily administered by the Lord Chancellor, as commands in the army or navy are bestowed by the Secretary of State for War, or by the First Lord of the Admiralty; but in all cases the concurrence of the Prime Minister is required, and if the impropriety or irregularity of any such appointment is brought to his knowledge, he is bound to withhold his consent. Although Mr. GLADSTONE's writings are seldom intelligible without a commentary, it would seem that he held the LORD CHANCELLOR exclusively responsible for the nomination of Sir R. COLLIER to the Common Pleas, while the removal to the Judicial Committee was to be effected by the PRIME MINISTER himself. In the case of any other writer it might also have been inferred that he admitted by his silence both the accuracy of the CHIEF JUSTICE's statements and the soundness of his conclusions; nor is it easy to understand how an evasion of the law becomes less censurable because it is "a joint transaction." Probably he persuaded himself that it was possible to resolve a complex irregularity into two parts or stages, of which each might be separately unobjectionable. There was no harm in making a law officer a Judge, and the statute itself provided that the vacancy in the Judicial Committee should be filled from the Bench. The LORD CHANCELLOR loaded the gun, the PRIME MINISTER pulled the trigger, and neither is answerable separately for consequences which could only have resulted from a joint transaction. The complaint that a Judge had been appointed not to discharge the duties of his office, but that he might acquire a fictitious qualification for another office, appears to have been too simple to penetrate the subtle windings of Mr. GLADSTONE's understanding. He also failed to observe that the CHIEF JUSTICE had protested especially against the completion of that part of the transaction which, on Mr. GLADSTONE's showing, was still incomplete. If the LORD CHANCELLOR was, at the date of Mr. GLADSTONE's letter, exclusively responsible for whatever had been done in the matter, it follows that Mr. GLADSTONE had not pledged himself to the promotion which he must have discovered to be irregular as soon as he received Sir A. COCKBURN's communication. In the words of the CHIEF JUSTICE's answer, "It was because the ulterior object of the appointment was to be your act that I took the liberty of addressing myself to you. Had I objected to the part of the transaction already completed, I should have addressed myself to the LORD CHANCELLOR." The formal distinction is accurately drawn, but it is absurd to distinguish for moral purposes between the acts of two persons who agree to adopt, each as far as his own power extends, the measures which are indispensable to the accomplishment of a common purpose. The effect of Mr. GLADSTONE's letter is to place on record the admission that he made the appointment to the Judicial Committee with full notice that it was an evasion of the law, and also that it was not even certainly legal. His real responsibility commenced when he allowed the LORD CHANCELLOR to make a fictitious appointment with

an ulterior design in which his own concurrence would be required.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR'S answer is a superfluous and almost cynical avowal of the act to which the CHIEF JUSTICE had objected. "The appointment has," he says, "been made with full knowledge on my part of the intention of Mr. GLADSTONE to recommend Sir ROBERT COLLIER for appointment as a member of the Judicial Committee under the 'Act.' The CHANCELLOR is of course willing to accept the responsibility of the proceeding, and to vindicate it at that conventional and mysterious epoch which, in official apologies, is called "the proper time." Sir A. COCKBURN is justified in his remark that a remonstrance on so grave a matter proceeding from the CHIEF JUSTICE of England might have been somewhat more courteously noticed. It is difficult to believe that the LORD CHANCELLOR, himself a Judge and lawyer of long standing, and of high professional character, can be really indifferent to the unanimous concurrence of the Bench and the Bar in Sir A. COCKBURN's expressions of disapproval. In one melancholy instance, which was itself perhaps "a joint transaction" of the PRIME MINISTER and the LORD CHANCELLOR, political claims which ought from their nature to have operated as a perpetual disqualification were recognised by promotion to a judicial office of inferior rank. In the present instance a competent Judge has been appointed, but a recent statute has been in spirit deliberately and plainly violated. It was an error to limit too closely the discretion of the Government; but the oversight or omission was intentional on the part of the Ministry. It was at that time supposed that Lord PENZANCE would accept the appointment of member of the Judicial Committee, and that Sir R. COLLIER would take his place as Judge of the Probate and Divorce Court. When the proposed arrangement was found to be impracticable, the CHANCELLOR seems, with the assent of Mr. GLADSTONE, at once to have resolved on correcting his own want of foresight by a disregard of his own recent Act of Parliament. In the conduct of the PRIME MINISTER it is impossible not to recognise the same spirit which prompted the issue of the Royal Warrant for the abolition of purchase. In both cases it was his intention to comply with the letter of the law; but the Royal Warrant infringed the Constitution, and the judicial appointment was an intentional evasion of a recent statute. The license which had not been assumed by any former Minister is characteristic of an ambitious politician who has already accustomed himself to appeal from Parliament, as well as from the opinion of the intelligent classes, to popular favour. Flesh and blood, as they are represented at mob meetings, care nothing for forms or for technical restraints, and democratic leaders have often been the natural precursors of despotism. It is probably by way of asserting the right of the Government to deal arbitrarily with the Bench, and perhaps also as a rebuke to the troublesome CHIEF JUSTICE of England, that Lord HATHERLEY and Mr. GLADSTONE have appointed an additional Judge of the Common Pleas, while they refuse to satisfy the far more urgent needs of the suitors in the Court of Queen's Bench. It can scarcely be supposed that Mr. GROVE has, like Sir R. COLLIER, only received a colourable and fictitious appointment.

MR. LOWE ON PRIMARY EDUCATION.

IT has fallen to Mr. LOWE to answer Mr. DIXON by anticipation. Whether it was accident or design that detailed him for this duty, the result has been fortunate as regards the Government. If the Birmingham malcontents could be conciliated by a refusal to do what they want, it would be by a refusal such as Mr. LOWE's. He hates the Denominational system as heartily as they do, and even while he is defending the use which the Education Act makes of Denominational schools, he is at no pains to disguise his abhorrence of them. It is with pride that he recalls his diligence in denouncing the blunders of the State in delegating the work of education to voluntary organizations. No one who remembers Mr. LOWE's administration of the Education Department will deny him the praise he claims. There was not a Denominational school manager who ever came in contact with him who did not feel that in the Vice-President of the Council he had to deal with a sleepless foe. It is the violence of Mr. LOWE's prejudice against the system under which primary education has hitherto been carried on that makes his criticism of the present agitation so valuable. Mr. DIXON himself could not go beyond the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER in strength of language; the difference between the two is that the one views the question as a mere theorist, while the other views it as a practical politician. "I detest Denominational schools," says Mr. DIXON, "and therefore I will not give them my custom,

"though I have no other means of getting the particular article I want." "I hate Denominational schools," says Mr. LOWE, "but I will not spite myself by refusing to buy what they have to sell, when it happens to be convenient for me to do so." This is the gist of his remarks on education, and as a matter-of-fact statement of one aspect of the question nothing can be more to the purpose. "Is it better that children should be taught in Denominational schools, or not be taught at all?" Mr. LOWE thrusts this inquiry home. He concedes the strength of the opposition excited by the educational policy of the Government. It may succeed in destroying the Denominational system, but supposing this accomplished, what would have been done? The existing means of educating children would have been destroyed, and for years to come there would be nothing to replace it. That is all. Children would not attend better schools or less sectarian schools than they attend now; they would, in a great number of cases, attend no schools at all. The Education League speak with the jauntiness natural to men who are simply critics. If they had had to furnish a creative element, their tone would be a good deal more subdued. Indeed, the break-up of the London branch on the question raised by Mr. PETER TAYLOR's retirement already indicates the presence of serious differences of opinion among the members. Five-and-twenty years ago the Government of the day might have "boldly confronted" the difficulty, and established schools of their own. Mr. LOWE heartily wishes they had taken this course. But in 1870 no such alternative was open to them. The ground was not, as it once was, a piece of virgin forest. The Denominational system was in possession, and that alone was a sufficient reason why the Government should avail themselves of it in framing the Education Act. The problem which the Government had to solve then is the problem which the School Boards throughout the country have to solve now. There are parishes in abundance which possess a Denominational school, and possess no other. If there are children in that parish whose parents cannot afford to pay the school fees, what is to be done with them? Is the School Board to find the money; or is a new school to be built for these few children, in order that the consciences of the ratepayers may not be vexed by having to pay for TOM or SUSAN learning reading, writing, and arithmetic at a school at which at some other time of the day a religious lesson is given; or is all thought of sending them to school to be given up?

This is an element in the controversy which has been too much lost sight of. A great deal has been said about the parents' conscience, and its value or worthlessness as compared with the ratepayers' conscience. But if School Boards refuse to pay Denominational school fees, a number of children whose parents have no conscience where education is concerned must be the sufferers. It is generally assumed that a School Board school will always be found by the side of every Denominational school, and that it will only be the perversity of the parent, prompted by the malice of the clergyman, that will lead to the latter being preferred. But in every large town there will be cases in which parents unable to pay the school fees for their children will live in outlying districts in which there will be no occasion to build a School Board school, inasmuch as all the children whose parents can afford to pay the fees are already provided for in Denominational schools. It will be impossible to insist on these children going to a public elementary school at a distance, while a public elementary school to which their parents are perfectly willing to send them is to be found at their doors. If they are to be educated at all, the School Board must provide a school for their special use. It may be said that wherever there are no non-denominational schools in existence, and no demand for them sufficient to justify a large expenditure in building, the Nonconformist ratepayers will waive their objections to the payment by School Boards of fees in Denominational schools. If so, what becomes of the plea of conscience? Surely if a ratepayer is not prevented by religious scruples from paying the fees for A. on the score that his parents live two miles from a School Board school, he need not in common consistency be prevented from paying the fees for B. on the score that his parents dislike the theological character of the School Board school. There need be no fear that School Boards will not have plenty to do with their money without undertaking to set up schools where they are not wanted. In many districts there will be no adequate school accommodation of any kind and no Denominational machinery capable of supplying the want. It will be time enough, as Mr. LOWE says, "to fight out the battle of Denominationalism" when it has been seen what the Act can do "in bringing up the poor neglected children who do not live "in neighbourhoods where schools have been founded by

"private persons." Even on their own showing the anti-Denominationalists are running into the mistake sometimes committed by philanthropists who spend in building model lodging-houses to hold a hundred people the money which, if it had been spent in improving the houses already on the ground, would have given decent homes to five hundred. They might at least wait until they have used up all the spaces suitable to their purpose on which no houses are standing. When every child in England is at school somewhere, the anti-Denominationalists will have a better right to bring on the discussion whether the children who are attending Denominational schools shall be draughted into School Board schools. Mr. LOWE has had experience enough of the Education Department to give point to his warning against making light of the "labour and trouble of bringing into working order a "large scholastic system"; and this labour and trouble will certainly not be lightened if the School Boards insist on doing, in addition to their own work, the work that is now done by Denominational schools. So far as this plan is adopted, the outlay now provided by voluntary effort will have to be provided out of rates "taken from persons who are but one "step removed from utter poverty." Nothing more injurious to the cause of education can well be imagined than a conflict between one set of ratepayers who refuse to pay the fees for attending existing schools and another set who refuse to pay for the building of new schools. The obvious compromise of allowing the children to remain away from school altogether is but too likely to be resorted to.

Mr. LOWE's censure of the programme of school work put forward by the London School Board is true in part, but only in part. So far as present needs are concerned, he is quite right in asserting the paramount importance of teaching children to read. A child who leaves school able to read perfectly—as easily, that is, as every child in the middle and upper classes can read—has a power of acquiring knowledge which is limited only by his own tastes and opportunities. A child who leaves school able to read imperfectly, no matter what amount of knowledge may have been crammed into him while there, "will in a few years be as if he had never been "at school at all." The fault of Mr. LOWE's reasoning is that it treats, or seems to treat, reading and knowledge as mutually exclusive alternatives in a school course. A child is either to learn to read or to learn something of geography, history, and physical science. As between the two, Mr. LOWE is no doubt right in choosing the former; but why should there be any necessary antagonism between them? Such antagonism may have existed at a time when the Education Department laid less stress than it now does on a certain standard of proficiency in the elements, and traces of it may still be visible in schools where the tradition of cramming a few show children has not died out. But in the nature of things there can be no reason why children should not be taught to read perfectly in the first instance, and then, in the time that still remains to them, be taught how to turn their faculty of reading to some account. In schools provided with good teachers and good reading-books, every child ought to be able to read perfectly by the age of ten or eleven. There will then remain two more years of school life, during which he may be, not crammed with knowledge which he will forget as soon as he goes away, but given a foretaste of the knowledge of which reading can put him in possession. To borrow Mr. LOWE's own illustration, it might have been kinder in Cæsus to give his friend the key of his treasury than to allow him on a single visit to bring out as much gold as he could carry, but the gift of the key would have been all the more useful if the receiver of it had at the same time been furnished with some rudimentary knowledge of what the treasury to which it would introduce him contained. That School Boards may disgust the ratepayers by attempting to teach too much in rate-supported schools may be admitted. But it would be unwise wholly to leave out of consideration the opposite danger that by teaching too little they may breed indifference to education on the part of parents and children alike.

THE AUSTRALIAN COLONIES AND THE HOME GOVERNMENT.

THE Ministers of the chief Australian Colonies have signed a joint Memorandum with reference to a despatch of Lord KIMBERLEY's as to certain differential duties imposed on foreign goods. As the despatch itself appears not to have been published, its purport can only be collected from the remonstrance. It would seem that the intercolonial arrange-

ments which have been rendered necessary or convenient by the differences of the respective tariffs operate unfavourably on foreign importation, and that they have been thought inconsistent with the English Commercial Treaty with the Zollverein. In the first place, the colonists declare their desire to maintain for a long and indefinite time their connexion with the Mother-country; and, as members of the British Empire, they deny that any treaty can be constitutionally made which treats the colonies as foreign communities. It might be hastily inferred by those who are unfamiliar with colonial ways of thinking that Australia was prepared to accept all the possible benefits and disadvantages which might result from the partnership which is claimed in all Imperial contracts; but the practical conclusions of the Memorandum seem to conflict with the preliminary recital. "With the internal arrangements of the Empire," according to the Delegates, "whether in its central or more "remote localities, foreign countries can have no pretence to "interfere; and stipulations respecting the trade of one part "of the Empire with another, whether by land or sea, are not "stipulations to which foreign Governments ought to be "allowed to become parties in any way." Accordingly, the remonstrants decline to be bound by the stipulations of any treaty which may prevent the colonies from imposing differential duties on foreign commodities. There is much to be said in favour of the general proposition that it is inexpedient to give foreigners a power of interfering with internal regulations of trade; but the objectionable principle is admitted as often as a commercial treaty is negotiated; and the Australian Delegates, notwithstanding the sweeping character of their protest, would probably not wish to prevent the conclusion of compacts exclusively relating to the United Kingdom, which they describe with more accuracy than elegance as a central locality. As the Imperial Legislature has long since abandoned the system of protective or differential duties, covenants against the imposition of charges which would never be thought desirable are purely ostensible concessions.

From the emphatic demand of the Delegates that the colonies shall not be treated as foreign countries, it would seem to follow that they should be bound by the provisions of Imperial treaties; but it would be idle to insist on the validity of a logical deduction which would directly clash with the substance of the Memorandum. If they have interpreted Lord KIMBERLEY's despatch correctly, they may perhaps from their own point of view have some ground of dissatisfaction. The principal object of commercial treaties is to induce foreign countries to establish moderate tariffs at the imaginary cost of an undertaking on the part of England to exercise the same profitable liberality. The articles which find access to Continental markets by the aid of commercial treaties are, with scarcely an exception, produced in the United Kingdom; and therefore the consideration for the reduced tariff of the foreign State tends to the benefit of the "central locality" rather than of the Empire at large. On the assumption commonly made in Europe, in America, and in Australia, that it is a losing transaction to buy in a cheap market, the colonies might be deemed to suffer by the possible influx of lightly taxed foreign commodities. The Delegates, in their Memorandum, adopt with amusing reiteration the name of Free-trade for their own selfish and short-sighted policy. It would be easy to ridicule the involuntary tribute which they pay in their language to sound economy, while they obstinately persist in depriving their constituents of the benefit of unrestricted commerce; but if they were justified in objecting to freedom of trade, they would be entitled to protest against liberal stipulations in foreign treaties.

In a string of Resolutions to the same effect with the Memorandum, the representatives of New South Wales, Tasmania, South Australia, and Victoria demand that no treaty or Act of Parliament should interfere with the alleged right of the colonies to agree for the reciprocal admission, duty free or on any other terms, of their respective productions; and in more general language they claim that Imperial interference with intercolonial fiscal legislation shall finally and absolutely cease. It is useless to inquire whether the colonies have a right to a concession which they have practically power to enforce. The Imperial Government, even if it had the means of modifying the colonial tariffs, could not assert any claim to fiscal control without a reversal of its recent and established policy. The protests and reclamations of English dependencies are not remarkable for deference or courtesy; and indeed they generally assume the form of declarations of an immutable purpose. The several Ministries in Australia are perfectly assured that they incur no

risk whatever in announcing their intention of levying differential duties in spite of any Imperial treaty. When the people of Boston threw the tea from the Indian fleet into their harbour they gave the signal for a war; but no English gunboat will fire on an Australian Custom-house because excessive duties have been levied on English or on foreign goods. There is no cheaper virtue than bold defiance of a non-existent danger. It is much easier to assert the right of making intercolonial agreements than to arrange the actual terms of the various contracts. New South Wales, having established a more exorbitant tariff than that which satisfies Victoria, found it necessary to maintain an inland line of Custom-houses on the frontier of the neighbouring colony. To avoid the impediment to trade Victoria agreed to compound by the payment of a fixed sum for the duties which are levied on intercolonial traffic; and the amount of the tribute has for several years been fixed at 60,000*l.* New South Wales now asks for an increase of the sum to 100,000*l.*, and Victoria naturally resists the extortion. If the negotiators fail to effect a compromise, the Customs line will be re-established; and perhaps at some remote period even colonial democracies may learn to appreciate the retrograde stupidity of their own legislation. The process would not be accelerated by didactic or practical interference on the part of the Imperial Government. The same politicians who squabble interminably with one another on the rival methods of administering a vicious system become unanimous as soon as they find an opportunity of exhibiting their common independence. Of late years Australian Ministries have coolly adopted the practice of transmitting Resolutions and other communications to the Secretary of State, through their respective Governors, who are not even consulted. Perhaps it is as well that forms should correspond to facts, and that communities which are invariably guided by their own inclinations should also take their own way of expressing their intentions. It is something that their unceremonious declarations should generally be accompanied by affable professions of their willingness to retain a tie by which they are never incommode.

Although it is not surprising that a certain school of politicians should dispute the utility of the one-sided relation between the Mother-country and the colonies, the instinctive feeling against the dissolution of the Empire is consistent with the soundest policy. The colonists after all for the most part entertain a friendly feeling to England, and in time they will perhaps become tired of the periodical indignation which finds its vent in pushing against an open door. Since the withdrawal of the Imperial garrisons the cost of the colonies is reduced within moderate limits, and the outlay is probably repaid several times over through the commercial preference which almost invariably results from political connexion. The colonial purchaser is unconsciously prejudiced in favour of English goods, because his tastes and habits are in a great measure formed on English models. The inevitable divergence would be widened or accelerated by separation; and in the meantime the price of any advantage which may accrue to the Mother-country is confined to the Colonial Estimates. It would be childish to feel serious annoyance at the peremptory tone of Australian Memorandums. A wise man who has no intention of refusing a concession will not be tempted to insist on pretensions which he disclaims merely because the request is bluntly preferred. The Government of the United States invariably connives at the neglect of Federal legislation by the Pacific States whenever they find obedience troublesome. During the war specie payments were continued in California; and to the west of the Rocky Mountains the homestead law is superseded by local customs relating to the tenure of land. The population of the Australian Colonies, including New Zealand, falls short of two millions; but it is impossible that the details of colonial government should be managed at home, nor are there any feasible means of exercising coercion. The bond of union is in the highest degree loose and elastic; but there is nothing to be gained, and something to be lost, by a breach of the connexion.

BIRMINGHAM AND THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

IT is natural and inevitable that the House of Lords, if it discharges its duties with firmness and determination, should occasionally give offence to a considerable number of people throughout the country. The task of revising, moderating, or resisting the demands of a popular Assembly cannot be performed so as to give unqualified satisfaction to those upon whom the restraint is imposed. A Court of Appeal is in the nature of things apt to be unpopular with

the Court below whose decisions it impugns, as well as with the suitors who resent the reversal of a judgment which has been given in their favour. There is no reason to doubt that a great many people think it very vexatious that the House of Lords should have obstructed the abolition of tests in the Universities and the passing of the Ballot Bill, and have been led to reflect that, if there had been no House of Lords, there would have been nothing to stand in the way of the immediate gratification of their desires. When a feeling of this kind exists, it is just as well that it should be frankly expressed, and that the advantages and disadvantages of a Second Chamber should be fully discussed. But those who undertake to discuss the matter, and above all those who recommend immediate and decisive action upon it, may at least be expected to take the trouble to think out what they have to say, and to master the simple elements of the subject. After months of preparation, the great Conference at Birmingham, which was summoned to pass judgment on the House of Lords, has met and talked, passed one or two vague abstract Resolutions directed against the present constitution of the obnoxious Assembly, and then adjourned in order to allow time for a Committee to determine what kind of substitute, if any, should be provided. Mr. DIXON could get no members of Parliament to keep him in countenance at the Conference except his colleague Mr. MUNTZ and Mr. LEWIS; but Mr. HOWELL and Mr. BRADELAUGH supplied the place of more sedate politicians; and at the evening gathering Citizen DILKE and Mr. A. HERBERT lent a revolutionary flavour to the proceedings. The arguments of the speakers were on a level with their personal authority. The only distinct idea in the minds of those who attended the Conference seems to have been that the House of Lords was offensive to themselves personally, because it sometimes hampered or delayed the accomplishment of sudden changes, and outraged their sense of equality by its invidious dignity. It is true that the "hereditary principle in legislation" does not ensure that every peer shall be wise and patriotic, and a schoolboy when he first makes the discovery is usually very much impressed by it. There are a great many things, however, which we discover at school which prove to have been discovered before, and which do not disturb conclusions that have been generally arrived at. Nobody with an historical conscience can deny that many peers have been not very wise, and some of them not very honest; and it is impossible to guarantee the absolute wisdom and honesty of the peerage at the present day. We fear there are members of the House of Lords who are not particularly well qualified to legislate for their country, but the same remark may be applied to members of the House of Commons. Mr. DIXON is of opinion that the sole title to a seat in the House of Lords should be fitness for the performance of the duties of that position, and it would certainly be desirable, if practicable, that this condition should be applied to both branches of the Legislature. The electoral principle in legislation is as much at fault as the hereditary principle in ensuring the perfect wisdom and integrity of the legislators. The Egyptians used to select the sacred cow by a mark on its skin, and it is conceivable that a very tolerable representative body might be collected by making certain physical features the qualification for admission. The truth is that any mode of election which can be devised must almost of necessity be loose and imperfect, and if on the whole it gives a fair representation, in a rough and ready way, of the classes who are intended to be represented, that is as much as we can expect. If we could make quite sure of the wisdom and patriotism of even a score of men, it would perhaps be enough to have a Cabinet, and we could dispense with the two Houses of Parliament.

The first Resolution, which was moved by Mr. DIXON, went on to say that the hereditary principle is unjust, because it confers upon a class powers which ought to be exercised only by the representatives of the nation; but this is obviously begging the question. The peers are, so far as their legislative functions are concerned, the representatives of the nation, inasmuch as the nation has authorised them to act for it to that extent; and it has to be shown that they do not correctly and adequately convey the opinions and protect the interests of the classes whom they are supposed to represent, and who, if there were only a House of Commons, would be in a great measure excluded from all share in the direction of affairs. The fallacy of the reasoning on which this Resolution and in fact all the other arguments of the Conference were based, lies in the assumption that a majority of the Parliamentary electors compose the whole people, and that if there are, say, five millions of voters *plus* one on one side, and five millions *minus* one on the other, it is necessary

that the former body should alone be consulted and should have the exclusive right of determining how the country shall be governed. The theory of the Constitution is that, while the great body of the people are represented by delegates of their own choice, the representation of the nation at large is completed by an hereditary peerage. The third Resolution, declaring that the ultimate decision on all questions must rest with the representatives elected by a majority of the people, is only a statement of the actual course of legislation. It is idle to disguise that physical force is the basis of government, and physical superiority and numerical preponderance may be assumed to go together. In the long run the majority is sure to have its own way, unless it is persuaded not to insist upon it. And in point of fact this is what has always happened in any conflict between the two Houses when the House of Commons has had the people at its back. The House of Lords has certainly no claim to infallibility; it has happened, as Sir G. C. LEWIS has said, that at times when the people were right the peers have been oligarchical, and that when the people have been wrong the peers have been democratic. But, whether right or wrong in their views on particular questions, the Lords have usually been justified in their resistance to the House of Commons by the existence of a considerable body of opinion in favour of their side of the question; and it cannot be said that they have persisted in their opposition in any case where it has been clearly shown that the country was against them.

The democratic doctors who assembled at this consultation on the case of a patient who has happily not yet been surrendered into their hands, found it less difficult to compose a fanciful diagnosis of dangerous symptoms than to prescribe the treatment which should be followed. Mr. DIXON suggested that the House of Lords should be elected by the House of Commons, and should be employed in little jobs of secondary legislation under the eye of its creator and master. Mr. MUNTZ was in favour of the Norwegian system, under which, when a Bill has been twice rejected by the Upper House, there is a conference between the two branches of the Legislature, at which a vote is taken which settles the question. Mr. A. HERBERT, with characteristic diffidence, expressed what he called "a very guarded opinion," that the best course would be to abolish the House of Lords at once and for all; and Sir C. DILKE, charmed with the simplicity of the idea, was disposed to endorse it, though he thought that it might perhaps be enough for the present to limit the range of subjects which the peers should be allowed to discuss. It is obvious that the question what should be done with the House of Lords depends on the object for which a change in its constitution is desired. Impatient revolutionists who are anxious to clear the way for sudden and violent changes will naturally be disposed to diminish or suppress the authority of the Upper House. Mr. LEATHAM, who did not attend the Conference, sent a letter in which he pointed out the danger of improving the composition of the Second Chamber. To fill it with persons of great ability, or who had served the country with distinction, would, he said, enhance its dignity and importance, and enable it to take up a much more commanding position than it now holds. An exclusively hereditary body would necessarily be weak, and he proposed that its power should be further curtailed by limiting its right of veto to the duration of a single Parliament. The consequence of such a rule would, no doubt, be a desperate effort to send up all kinds of violent measures to the House of Lords in the last Session of an expiring Parliament, in order that the Peers might thus be compelled to accept any of them which should again be presented when the new Parliament met. It is significant that those who are most anxious to neutralize the influence of the Upper House are also endeavouring to put an end to all variety of representation in the House of Commons, and to establish the direct and unqualified supremacy of a pure numerical majority. The use of a Second Chamber is not merely to check rash and ill-considered legislation, but to encourage conciliation and compromise in the management of affairs, and to ensure that every measure shall be fully discussed and clearly understood before it is finally passed. Mr. MILL may perhaps be justified in believing that an aristocratic House of Lords can be powerful only in an aristocratic state of society; but this is an argument in favour, not of abolishing the House of Lords, but of considering whether it cannot be strengthened by judicious improvements. One branch of the Legislature is not more sacred than the other, and there is no reason why the House of Lords should not be reformed as well as the House of Commons, if any reforms can be shown to be desirable. Whether or not life peerages are expedient on general grounds, the constitutional objections which were

formerly taken to them are not likely to be insisted on with much effect. It is at least obvious that, if a Second Chamber is to be an efficient element in the Constitution, it should be stronger than the House of Lords is at present, and it is to fortify, not to weaken, that Assembly, that the efforts of those who are reformers and not revolutionists should be directed.

POOR STUDENTS.

NOT long ago Lord Derby made some remarks upon which we commented at the time, as to the possible dangers of diffusing universal education. Those dangers, whatever they may be, are obviously too remote to exercise much influence upon our present action. It will be long before English ploughmen will acquire such familiarity with Sanskrit as to incapacitate them for the discharge of their daily duties. In America, however, affairs move at a more rapid pace. Great interest has been excited within the last few years by the University founded by Mr. Cornell; and, whatever may be the success of the experiment, it is impossible not to feel a warm sympathy with a scheme so creditable to the enterprising liberality of our cousins. The leading idea of Mr. Cornell seems to have been to open to the poorer classes of his fellow-countrymen the means of obtaining the highest education. At present the University is of course in an unfinished state, and it would be premature to express any confident opinion as to its probable future. We learn, however, some interesting details from a letter recently published in the *New York Times*. A Correspondent of that paper has been paying a visit to Cornell University, and gives some account of the present condition of things. He speaks with enthusiasm of the laboratories, libraries, and museums which are rapidly rising amongst the forests and waterfalls of Western New York. We need not dwell upon these material appliances of learning further than to say that they show that the warm interest excited by the University in America has taken practical shape in a large number of generous gifts. The Correspondent had a conversation, which to us is more interesting, with one of the typical students, and the views which he expresses have a practical bearing upon some questions which will have to be considered in England. The student of whom he speaks was a poor man, who, as we need hardly say, was engaged in the study of Sanskrit. That is the proper study of an enlightened youth at the present day. The justice of the German cause was conclusively proved by the fact that a private soldier wrote a report of the campaign in Sanskrit; and the fact that a young man compelled to support himself by manual labour was immersed in Sanskrit, and capable of discussing the theories of Bunsen and Max Müller, will of course be a presumption that Cornell University is doing all that can be required of it. We must, however, venture to look a little more closely at the facts. The student in question, as we are told, supports himself by labour on the farm. On the day on which he was interviewed he had had six hours' work in laying down drains, and declared that, though he disliked the work, he was not at all tired, or at any rate not too tired for intellectual labour. From further inquiries it appears that sixty-one out of about seven hundred students are supporting themselves by different kinds of labour. This particular youth could make about four dollars a week, and could support himself upon three, so that he could supply himself with coarse clothes as well as with food. The quantity of employment is at present limited, though it is hoped that the water-privileges of the district will gradually lead to the introduction of factories, when a much larger number of students will be enabled to earn wages. The Correspondent expresses an admiration in which everybody must share for the energy of this hard-working student, but is apparently a little sceptical as to the possibility of applying the same principles on a much larger scale.

Two or three remarks upon this statement naturally suggest themselves. It seems rather unreasonable, in the first place, to have established a University of this kind at a place where the demand for labour must at present be so small. If the object was to combine manual labour with intellectual study, it would have seemed more natural at first sight to have brought the Professors and museums to some centre where all kinds of manual labourers could easily find employment. But, wherever the University might be placed, it is obvious that our Sanskrit student must be a man of very unusual energy. "As a general rule," he observed, "the students attempt to work, and, finding it rather rough, give it up in despair, and go home." That is precisely what we should have expected. So far as it has gone the experiment seems to demonstrate a very simple fact—namely, that if you provide a very cheap course of instruction, a certain number of the intellectual élite of the poorer classes will combine to take advantage of it, whilst supporting themselves by earning daily wages. The same phenomenon frequently occurs at the Scotch Universities, and it is not surprising that in a country where rising from the ranks is so common as in America, and in a place which has attracted so much attention as Cornell, as many as sixty-one students should have been found to try the experiment. It does not prove that any large number of farm-labourers can be induced to learn Sanskrit in the intervals of ploughing; but simply that, if you afford certain facilities, the most energetic members of the class will manage to secure an education very much above the average.

We do not say this by way of undervaluing the results obtained.

We think them very excellent so far as they have gone. It is no small thing to enable energetic and able youths of all classes to make the best of any talents that they may possess; and we should be very glad to see a sprinkling of similar students at Oxford and Cambridge. If they could be introduced, they would probably do something to improve the general tone of those venerable bodies, and to raise the value of intellectual energy as compared with mere idleness or muscular exertion. It is not easy to say how far the fact we have mentioned throw any light upon the possibility of obtaining such a result. It may be remarked that there is nothing to prevent such students from being attracted as matters actually stand. The necessary expenses of becoming a student at our English Universities are very small. If a lad chose to support himself by weaving cloth, or binding books, or planing boards at Oxford or Cambridge, and had sufficient superfluous energy to attend lectures in the intervals of his work, he would find a great deal of sympathy, and would probably be able to get as much assistance in his studies as he could possibly require. He would have need of unusual energy, but so he has at Cornell. A man who would study Sanskrit after six hours' ploughing in America would be able to do the same in England. In one respect he may be thought to have even greater advantages. If he could win a share of the endowments, he would be able, as in fact many youths are actually able, to support himself without manual labour of any kind. The real difficulties in his way would be of a different kind. The inducement to such exertion would be smaller in proportion, as it is more difficult for a poor man in England to support himself in any career after the termination of his studies. The general tone of the place would be less favourable to him, as far as a certain standard of living is enforced by the public opinion of the undergraduates. And, further, it is difficult for anybody to obtain a scholarship or other assistance without having previously qualified himself by an education which is generally out of the reach of all but the richer classes.

Of these obstacles, the first is obviously beyond the power of any University reforms. It is not, and probably it never can be, as easy for a very poor man to raise himself into a class above his own in England as in a new country. The inducement to make any great effort must be smaller in proportion to the chances of failure. Putting this consideration aside, there may still be room for encouraging talent amongst the poorer classes far more liberally than is at present the case. The admirers of our English system are accustomed to boast of the perfect fairness with which the prizes of our Universities are distributed. They are given to the most promising candidates without the smallest regard to their social position. The fact is undeniable, and it is creditable as far as it goes. The limitations, however, to the operation of the system are painfully obvious. It is all very well to throw open prizes to free competition; but nothing can be plainer than that, as a general rule, the increase of competition is very little in favour of poor men. The tendency is to increase steadily the qualifications demanded from candidates. A boy who wins an exhibition as a freshman must now have gone through a severe course of preparatory training, unless in circumstances very exceptional, and daily becoming more exceptional. As such training involves considerable expense, the practical result is that the more prizes are thrown open the more difficult it is for any but the rich to win them. The old system of requiring poverty as a condition has been abandoned, and for reasons which, on the whole, are satisfactory. The consequence is, however, that those who have got more, and those who have not have very little chance of improving their positions. There is a further difficulty which is less generally noticed. In order to succeed in a competitive examination of this kind, it is necessary not only to obtain a training which is expensive at the moment, but to obtain a training which is good for very little else. A boy, for example, may win an exhibition at Cambridge by studying mathematics for two or three years before entering. If he succeeds, he may pursue his studies as he pleases; but, if he fails, his training has been thrown away for most practical purposes. This is such a risk as a poor man can hardly afford to run. Even if he could obtain the previous training gratuitously, the youthful mechanic might doubt whether it was worth while to employ two or three precious years in studies which, in the event of failure, would appear to him to be almost useless. This is one of the incidental evils of the excessive competition encouraged at our Universities, to which it is difficult to see any direct remedy. In short, we may assume that the attractive process of simply offering large money rewards for boyish proficiency is much more likely to stimulate the energies of the higher classes than to encourage the rising of talent from the ranks.

We cannot consider at any length what is the proper mode of meeting these difficulties. One or two conclusions, however, seem to be indicated. One, for example, is the importance of constructing a more complete educational system by which the lowest schools in the country may be connected by a gradually ascending scale with the Universities. A certain number of the most promising boys might thus be drafted annually from the lowest classes to receive the highest education which the country can offer. A regular ladder must be constructed, of which at present only the uppermost steps are in existence. The system of open exhibitions is not complete unless there is a regular gradation without the breaks which now occur. The desirableness of framing some such system has been pointed out too often to require any enforcement. Even with that improvement we may doubt

whether all that could be desired would be done. The intensity of competition would be increased and extended to less mature minds, and many evils, often described, would eventually accompany the process. The education given under a system of universal competition tends to become narrowed as examinations become rather an end than a means. Some system devised upon wider principles is required in order to bring the best kind of education within easier reach of the poorest classes. The experience of Cornell suggests one mode in which there is great room for improvement. Many English reformers have urged the propriety of devoting some part of our University endowments to the support of affiliated schools in the great towns. The possibility of carrying out some such plan deserves serious consideration, though it would be premature to consider details. An attempt has been made by Durham to do something of the kind. We can see no reason why, in some form or other, Oxford and Cambridge should not extend the sphere of their influence by sending out some kind of scientific missionaries to establish lectures in the great centres of population, as well as by holding examinations according to the present system. The position of the Universities themselves would be greatly strengthened by some such arrangement, and the poorer classes would have the advantages of first-rate instruction brought close to their doors. The suggestion must necessarily be of the vaguest kind at present, but it may be worth notice as we understand that some such scheme has been already under discussion.

THE LIBERAL PLEA FOR PERSECUTION.

THE controversy raised by Professor Huxley at the London School Board has brought to the front advocates of his pronounced odium *anti-theologicum* in quarters where it might have been least expected. Both the general question of toleration, and the particular question about denominational school fees which has elicited the discussion, are so important that we need make no apology for returning to the subject. It is an old proverb that extremes meet, and there is evidently a school of Liberals who agree heart and soul with Ultramontanes in the principle of persecution, though they would of course differ in its application. We cannot help being reminded of a reported conversation between the present Pope and an English convert who was supposed to have some influence with the Russian Government. His Holiness was exhorting him to do what he could to put an end to the persecution of Catholics in that country. But, replied his interlocutor, I think the State is quite right to put down what it considers a pernicious error, and we, Holy Father, should do just the same if the conditions were reversed. Certainly, replied the Pope; but then we are right, and they are wrong, and that makes all the difference. There does not seem to us to be much to choose in principle between the doctrine of Pius IX. and the doctrine of Locke as enunciated the other day by Professor Huxley in the *Fortnightly Review*. The gist of his contention lies in the following significant passage, which a subsequent writer in the same periodical has quoted in order to expose the fallacy it contains:

Has the State no right to put a stop to gross and open violations of common decency? And if the State has, as I believe it has, a perfect right to do all these things, are we not bound to admit with Locke, that it may have a right to interfere with "Popery" and "atheism," if it be really true that the practical consequences of such beliefs can be proved to be injurious to civil society?

We may just observe in passing that, however strong may be Professor Huxley's convictions of the injurious consequences of Popery, most thinking persons will regard the results of an open profession and promulgation of atheism—and the question here is of what is publicly taught, not of what is privately believed—as at least equally dangerous. And so we may at once assume that Popery and atheism ought to be put down with a strong hand, as the Spanish Inquisition put down heresy, though not necessarily with the same excess of cruelty. On this startling theory Miss Taylor observes very pertinently, that the quiet assumption of certain religions being "demonstrated to be against the welfare of society" comes rather oddly from an advanced Liberal and a distinguished man of science, who must be aware of his own failure to establish a simple physical fact, to himself most evident, to the general satisfaction even of scientific men; while the difficulty of overthrowing a cherished belief in religion, which to most men is far dearer than any scientific theories, would be indefinitely greater. While in the ordinary relations of daily life the teaching of experience has gradually enforced the lesson of toleration, the craving for a sense of certainty and inward peace in religious matters is apt to make men less tolerant of differences of belief. But here, too, the accumulation of experience has produced its effect; "heretics have dwindled in men's imaginations from monsters into men," and most people have become less confident as to their carrying out in practice the alarming "logical consequences of their creed." It is, however, on the plea of the "proved" mischief of these logical consequences that Professor Huxley would have the State inflict religious disabilities on Roman Catholics, if not on atheists, just as it is entitled to put down gross violations of common decency.

As to the alleged analogy, it seems to us wholly beside the mark. No doubt we should put down the public worship of Priapus or Cottytto, though a cult equally outrageous has been tolerated, if not more than tolerated, by the British Government in India. No doubt, also, to adopt Mr. Huxley's own

illustration, we should put down Thuggee. But we should do so, not because the logical consequences of such forms of religion were demonstrably injurious to the public weal, but because their existing practice was a gross outrage on the safety or the moral sense of the community; just as, according to Dr. Arnold—we are not now discussing the historical accuracy of his statement—the early Christians were persecuted, not because their teaching would ultimately prove subversive of the Empire, but because they disobeyed its laws. In the mouth of Mr. Murphy or the ingenuous compilers of the *Confessional Unmasked* the analogy of Phallic and Roman Catholic worship would be very much to the point; but violations of common decency are wholly distinct from the supposed "practical consequences" of an erroneous belief. We are aware that Mr. Huxley is speaking of demonstrated consequences, and we may be told, as indeed we have been told by one of the ablest and most candid of his supporters, that the tendency of reliance on an infallible authority to fetter the intellect and enslave the will is as obvious as the injury such a system must entail on civil society; while, on the other hand, we are somewhat inconsistently reminded that he does not advocate persecution of Catholics, but only the refusal to give them any State assistance in propagating their belief. Certainly the Professor's reasoning, if it is worth anything, goes much further than this. A religion which made murder and obscenity part of its programme would deserve far sharper handling than a mere refusal to assist its schools; and we are strongly inclined to suspect that our modern advocates of intolerance are only withheld by the hopelessness of any practical result from pushing their argument to its legitimate conclusion. Waiving that point, however, let us assume for argument's sake, what we do not care to discuss here, that their estimate of the logical effects of Roman Catholic, or, if they prefer to put it so, Ultramontane, teaching is correct. So, very likely, is Professor Huxley's view of the *Hippocampus major*, which nevertheless, as his critic in the *Fortnightly* observes, is disputed by many scientific men of high repute. The number is vastly greater of men, not at all his inferiors in moral and religious earnestness, who would quite as vehemently reject his indictment against what was once the creed of the whole of Europe, and is still the creed of a large majority of professing Christians; and it looks rather like an assumption of infallibility to lay down as a demonstrated certainty that they are wrong. Let us take a parallel case. The practical consequences of Lutheranism have been shown by keen reasoners to be of the most shockingly immoral kind, and there are passages in the Reformer's own writings which would go far to "demonstrate" the justice of the criticism. Yet what would be thought of a proposal to suppress Lutheran teaching, or at least to put it under exceptional disabilities, because Luther maintains that a man who is justified by faith may commit murder or fornication a thousand times a day with impunity? To say that Lutherans, like other people, are influenced by various motives quite independent of the logical consequences of their professed opinions, is no reply; for neither do Ultramontane Catholics attempt to murder their heretical neighbours or to dethrone the Queen, nor do they even teach that it would be an act of piety to do so. If they did we should know what to do with them, and certainly should not be wasting our time in disputes about the payment of their school fees.

There is no need to enter here on any discussion of the principle of religious endowments. If the State is to endow at all, it must obviously either select, according to the old theory, the religion which it holds to be the truest, or support, according to modern practice, the Church of the majority, or aid all sects equally in proportion to their numerical claims. And in neither of the last two cases can it take any note of the truth or error of their creeds. But to treat Mr. Huxley's objection to Roman Catholic school fees as a refusal of religious endowment is to put the matter on a false issue. The question is not one of endowments, but of disabilities. The payment in any case is given solely for the secular instruction; but it is contended that it should not be given to those teachers, otherwise well qualified, who propose to add gratuitously religious instruction which is regarded by their critics as no better than a mass of pernicious error. To refuse that aid is not simply to leave Denominational schools "slightly handicapped in the race," but, as far as the operation of the Education Act goes, to throw them out of the running altogether. And accordingly Mr. Huxley very consistently avowed his desire to close all Roman Catholic schools, if he could. The suggestion that "Denominational" parents may pay out of their own pockets for the separate schooling of their children, while yet they are taxed equally with their neighbours for the schools to which they cannot conscientiously send them, is a very strange application of the principle of religious liberty. It is to put an embargo on religion—for religious teaching cannot help being denominational—not to refuse to support it. And when this is defended on the ground that such teaching is demonstrably injurious to the best interests of the individual or the State, the question necessarily obturates itself. Who is to judge what is demonstrated and what is not? There are a number of persons, neither knaves nor fools, who would object quite as strongly to having their children educated in Mr. Huxley's principles as he can possibly object to Roman Catholic education. Or, to put the matter in another way, there are a number of parents who very decidedly demur to having their children brought up without any dogmatic, or, in modern phrase, denominational teaching. And conspicuous among

these last are Roman Catholic parents, who for the most part are very poor, and who would therefore be compelled, if Mr. Huxley's advice were acted upon, either to leave their children in the gutter, or have them trained up in schools where they would be taught nothing of what, as they believe, is of all knowledge the most vitally important. We do not call this a refusal of complicity in error, or even an infliction of disabilities. It is a form, and a very vexatious form, of petty persecution. And it is not the less persecution because it is advocated not in the interests of religious orthodoxy against the "fanatics of heretical pravity," as the old inquisitors expressed it, but in the name of civil expediency. There is no persecution, great or small, that has not been excused by the supposed interests of the State. Protestants were burnt in Spain, and Catholics hung at Tyburn, chiefly because their doctrines were held, and from the point of view of their persecutors reasonably held, to be exceedingly "injurious to civil society." But experience has abundantly illustrated the fabled contest of the sun and the wind in inducing the traveller to lay aside his cloak. Persecuted sectaries are sure to prove bad subjects, and are not unlikely to qualify themselves for their punishment after the fact. The Ultramontane press may denounce the fundamental principles of modern society if it pleases, and, sooth to say, Professor Huxley and his friends are doing very much the same when they denounce "the pet doctrine of modern Liberalism, that the toleration of error is a good thing in itself." But Ultramontane schoolmasters will not teach their pupils to rebel against a Constitution under which they receive just and kindly treatment. No doubt it would be easy to give practical point to the most pernicious doctrines of the Syllabus. And the surest way to do so is to let it be practically understood that a Protestant State like England "has a right to interfere with Popery and atheism," and intends, as against the first and more mischievous error of the two, to exercise its right.

CITIZEN DILKE.

SIR CHARLES, or, as we suppose he must henceforth be called, Citizen Dilke has been formally adopted into the sacred brotherhood of the International Association, and is to be supported by that body at a great democratic gathering which is to be held in his honour in St. James's Hall. The idea of this demonstration appears to have originated with the Land and Labour League; and the deputation from that Society which went to invite the co-operation of the Internationalists so far forgot themselves as to speak of "Sir Charles" by his title—an offence which drew down on them a stern rebuke from Mr. John Hales, the Secretary of the International. One of the aims of the Association, he said, was to abolish all invidious distinctions, and "the great Republican" was known to it only as a citizen like the rest. The Secretary further intimated that "it was generally understood by the International that Citizen Dilke should be the first President of the British Republic"; so that the abolition of dignities is not, it would seem, to be so absolute as was supposed. Even a baronet may consent to be called Citizen now for the sake of being called President hereafter. Although Citizen Dilke's claims were fully acknowledged, there seems to have been a disposition on the part of some of those present to "run" Citizen Gladstone for the vacant office. The elder statesman's memorable declaration about "flesh and blood" was recalled with hopeful gratitude, and it was significantly suggested that "probably Gladstone would go much further even than he does if he were not so fettered by others." But Citizen Dilke was pronounced to be young, and "no doubt honest," and was preferred. It may appear that the appointment is somewhat premature, and that it would be time enough to think about a President when a Republic has actually been proclaimed. "First catch your Republic" is the advice which might be paraphrased from the familiar maxim of the cookery-book. Mr. Hales and his friends are apparently of opinion that a wise foresight provides for every contingency in advance, and that it is the secret of success never to be at a loss for anything that may be required. If it is suggested that the crowning of the edifice must necessarily be postponed until the edifice is erected, it may be asked in reply, what is the good of erecting the edifice unless you are sure you have something to crown it with? All uneasiness on this score has now been removed. The Internationalists have a President after their own heart ready to be produced at a moment's notice, and consequently there need no longer be any hesitation about remodelling the Constitution and getting rid of the Queen. We gather, however, that there are still some details to be settled. It does not appear that it has yet been decided what costume the President shall wear, in which palace he is to establish his quarters, or how much is to be allowed for his Civil List.

One of the first duties of the Elect of Humanity under the St. Simonian system was to *changer de peau*. It was discovered that the hands of the apostles were too white to save the people, and it was deemed necessary to darken them by hard manual labour. It is not stated whether a similar preparation will be required for high office under the Socialist Republic, but it is apparently the object of the working-men who have joined the propaganda to change their skin in a contrary sense to the St. Simonian operation; they have for the most part ceased to be working-men, except in name, and have discovered an easier and more lucrative occupation. A baronet, however, who accepts the Presidency of an Internationalist Republic may perhaps be required to

assimilate himself in manners and appearance to the democracy which he is expected to represent. It will not be enough merely to call himself Citizen; he must be careful not to outrage the self-respect of the people by practising the supercilious refinements of an aristocrat. The relations between the President and the Council of the International will also require some delicate adjustment, especially as, judging from the Parisian precedent, they may be awkwardly complicated by the sudden eruption of other self-constituted Councils and Committees, charged by their own authority with the salvation of the people. The Secretary of the International is very anxious to have it understood that a Republic in itself is not worth contending for. It was, as he remarked, a Republican Government which shot the patriots of the Commune, and it is conceivable that a Republican Government in England might make short work with the philanthropists of the International if they attempted to disturb it. It does not seem to have occurred to Mr. Hales that no Government, whether Republican or not, can allow itself to be attacked with impunity. The Commune claimed and exercised the same right of self-defence as the Government at Versailles; and it is certain that the Internationalists or the Fenians, if ever they had the chance, would deal in a very summary manner with any persons who challenged their authority. It may be urged on behalf of the Constitution of this country, which the Internationalists have especially pledged themselves to destroy, that it is at least the only Constitution in Europe under which their existence is tolerated. It is natural that they should share with the Ultramontanists a profound contempt for the liberty which allows them to agitate and conspire, and which they would certainly not concede to others if they were themselves in power. At the same meeting at which the choice of Citizen Dilke as President was proclaimed, the Secretary submitted a series of rules which had been prepared by the Supreme Council of the Association, and which are intended to place the whole organization under the absolute and despotic control of a few individuals. The Internationalist Republic would of course be governed in a similar manner.

The ideal of Republican liberty which Mr. Hales and his friends have in view is very much the same as that of a number of other politicians at the present time, some of whom would perhaps be surprised and shocked to find themselves identified with the Dilkeites and Internationalists. It is simply liberty to a dominant body, representing their own opinions, to coerce the rest of the community into submitting to them. It is not, as Mr. Hales says, a mere Republic that is wanted, but an Internationalist Republic; and in the same way changes in the Constitution, more or less violent, are demanded by other fanatical sects, who would no doubt be glad to establish, if they could, a Teetotal or a Contagious Diseases Republic. Those who are so impatient of the checks and balances of the existing system probably imagine that the despotic promptitude of the new machinery would operate exclusively in their own interest, and forget or ignore the possibility of its being turned against themselves. Even the Internationalists, who have the least to lose and the most to gain from a revolution, might profit by the instructive experience of events in France. We are not aware that Sir C. Dilke has consented to become the adopted child of Dr. Marx's Association, or that he has directly expressed approval of its objects. But it may be assumed that it has paid him this ominous compliment because it believes either that he is not indisposed to assist its designs, or at least that the political changes which he advocates would facilitate their realization. The latest manifesto from High Holborn protests significantly against the monstrous conduct of the "*classes possédantes*" who appeal to brute force to protect what they deem their rights. The Internationalists would naturally prefer a peaceful division of property under the direction of a Government of their own choosing. Sir C. Dilke, Mr. Auberon Herbert, and other flighty young men who are so enamoured of a Republic in theory, would do well to consider to what uses it might and would be applied in fact, if it were possible to establish one.

Meanwhile the prospects of Republicanism are not encouraging. The spasmodic demonstrations to which we have lately been treated are an indication rather of the uneasiness and desperation of the leaders than of the progress of the movement. Personal differences between Mr. Odger and the President of the Patriotic Society at the "Hole in the Wall" have led to some curious revelations. Agitators find it difficult to live on air, and there are incidental expenses connected with agitation which must be met. The organ of a great party which is chary of subscriptions cannot long be kept going by the raffle of a bed-quilt; and there are printers and billstickers' accounts for placards which are still unpaid, as well as "a bill of 14*l.* for getting up the last Hyde Park demonstration." It is stated that the delegates of the Reform League were paid 1*l.* a day while on the stump, and several of the same so-called working-men are at present in the service of the Liberation Society. It is complained that the real working-men, who are ready to listen to rousing speeches, will not contribute to the support of the speakers and the expenses of the meetings; and it is evident that the cost of agitations is defrayed by quite another class.

Sir C. Dilke appears to be determined to persist in his tour of revolutionary agitation, and others have been tempted to follow his example. Mr. Charles Watt, who advertises himself as the "Author of Mr. Gladstone's Questionable Book," is lecturing in the North of England on the Abuses of the Monarchy; while Mr. Bradlaugh and Mr. Odger (who was mobbed and hooted at

Reading) are similarly engaged in the South. It is desirable that it should be understood how far the agitators of this school are entitled to the countenance of the authorities. At Bolton and Derby Sir C. Dilke's meetings led to serious disturbances, which the police appear to have been unable or unwilling to suppress. At Derby, it is said, the magistrates declined to order the police to interfere on behalf of the lecturer, and at Stalybridge the Mayor is said to have encouraged the mob to drive Sir Charles out of the town if he dared to present himself. If this is true, there can of course be only one opinion of the conduct of the Mayor of Stalybridge, and his qualifications for the position he occupies; but it is not certain that the magistrates are bound to give Sir C. Dilke a body-guard of police whenever he chooses to demand one. There is an obvious distinction between delivering a lecture containing a statement of individual opinion, which does not commit the audience either to approval or disapproval, and inviting a public meeting to pass resolutions endorsing the statements of the lecturer; and it is this latter course which, as we understand, Sir C. Dilke has pursued. He has distinctly challenged public opinion, and he has therefore no right to complain if the response is unfavourable. It is difficult for a mass of people to express anything which they feel very strongly in a quiet and decorous manner, and if there has been unnecessary and unjustifiable violence on the part of Sir Charles's opponents, it must be remarked that his friends appear in each instance to have assumed a provokingly defiant attitude, and to have precipitated disorder by their own behaviour. It is stated that at Bolton the Dilkeites went to the meeting armed with cudgels, and at Derby it was a summons from the platform to the friends of the lecturer in the body of the hall which was the signal for the fray. The magistrates may have a right to prohibit or disperse a gathering that threatens to produce a riot; but an agitator who deliberately invites an expression of public opinion on a question of a highly exciting character must not be surprised if he is ill received. On the other hand, a lecturer who is content merely to state his own opinions in a room hired by himself to an audience which is not asked to express an opinion, is entitled to protection; but even here there are limits, which have been reached in Mr. Murphy's case, and perhaps nearly reached in Sir C. Dilke's, to the amount of protection which it is practicable to afford. The preservation of the public peace must be the primary consideration, and if a speaker goes out of his way to inflame and exasperate popular passions and prejudices, he can hardly expect that the police shall be withdrawn in a body from their ordinary duties in order to ensure him a quiet hearing. The questions which Sir C. Dilke has chosen to agitate cannot be profitably discussed at public meetings, and it is in his power to submit them to an Assembly where they can be legitimately and satisfactorily dealt with. It is now known that if he had gone to the House of Commons with his complaints in the first instance they would at once have been answered, and confuted. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has stated that the Queen has paid hundreds of thousands of pounds of Income-tax, and is quite ready to analyse Sir Charles's other charges when he presents them in his place in Parliament. Mr. Lowe's straightforward and manly speech contrasts favourably with the Premier's faltering and ambiguous reply to Sir C. Dilke, at the Guildhall banquet, and it is to be regretted that the Chancellor of the Exchequer is not more frequently the spokesman of the Government.

RAVENNA.

If we seek through the world for a city which is absolutely unique in its character and interest, we shall find it at Ravenna. It is a city in which, as soon as we set foot, we at once find ourselves among the memorials of an age which has left hardly any memorials elsewhere. The sea which once gave Ravenna its greatness has fallen back and left the once Imperial city like a wreck in a wilderness. In the like sort the memory of an age, strange if not glorious, full of great changes if not of great deeds, has passed away from other spots without leaving any visible memorial; at Ravenna the memorials of that age are well nigh all that is left. It is well that such a strange corner of history should still abide as a living thing in one forsaken corner of Europe. It is well that there should be one spot from which the monuments of heathen Rome and of mediæval Christendom are alike absent, and where every relic breathes of the strange and almost forgotten time which comes between the two. At Ravenna the amphitheatre of Verona and the cathedral of Milan, nay even the more venerable temple which covers the bones of Ambrose, would alike be out of place. We walk its streets, and we feel glad that we do not walk among the stately arcades of Padua and Bologna, that our eye is not met by such memories of municipal freedom as we see at Pistoia and Piacenza, or by such frowning relics of signorial and ducal rule as seem still to keep their grasp on Milan and Verona. Ravenna, like other cities, had its commonwealth and its lords, but a single incon siderable tower and a few not very conspicuous tombs are the only traces left either of the commonwealth or of the tyranny. Two or three mediæval churches do not seriously interfere with the character of the city, and the Renaissance cathedral, eyesore as it is, is well nigh forgotten beside its own baptistry and campanile. Indeed, when we casually enter its walls, and light on a priest saying mass in ancient forum, neither before the altar nor on its north side, but looking westward alike on

altar and congregation, we feel that, if the bricks and stones of the elder church have vanished, the usages of primitive times still live in the home which may fittingly be their last resting-place. So again, on two of the few later monuments of Ravenna we look with other eyes. Later in date, they do in fact carry on in a strange way the traditions which make the city, to a lover of the days of the latest Roman and the earliest Teutonic powers, the very goal of his pilgrimage, the very centre of the earth. The Venetian column in the market-place tells of the days of the greatest prosperity that Ravenna has seen in later times; but it has also a strange fitness that the spot where the elder Roman power lingered on the longest should have become part of the possessions of the city among whose islands the true Roman life lived on when it had passed away from the mainland. And the one object which to many minds will ever give Ravenna its greatest charm, the tomb which contains the most precious dust within its walls, in truth forms another link in the same chain. We need not mourn that Dante lies far away from his own Florence. A whole of which Florence was but a part may truly claim its ten parts in him. The poet of the Empire could nowhere sleep so well as among the Caesars of whom he dreamed.

With these exceptions, of which the two last and most striking are no real exceptions, all the monuments of Ravenna belong to the days of transition from Roman to medieval times, and the greater part of them come within the fifth and sixth centuries. It was then that Ravenna became, for a season, the head of Italy and of the Western world. The sea had made Ravenna a great haven; the falling back of the sea made her the ruling city of the earth. Augustus had called into being the port of Cæsarea as the Peirceus of the old Thessalian or Umbrian Ravenna. Haven and city grew and became one; but the faithless element again retreated; the haven of Augustus became dry land covered by orchards, and Classis arose as the third naval station, leaving Ravenna itself an inland city. Again has the sea retreated; Cæsarea has utterly perished; Classis survives only in one venerable church; the famous pine forest has grown up between the third haven and the now distant Hadriatic. Out of all this grew the momentary greatness of Ravenna. The city, girded with the threefold zone of marshes, causeways, and strong walls, became the impregnable shelter of the later Emperors, and the earliest Teutonic Kings naturally fixed their royal seat in the city of their Imperial predecessors. When this immediate need had passed away, the city fell into its now natural insignificance, and it plays hardly any part in the history of medieval Italy. Hence it is that the city is crowded with the monuments of an age which has left hardly any monuments elsewhere. In Britain indeed, if Dr. Merivale be right in the date which he gives to the great Northern wall, we have a wonderful relic of those times; but it is the work, not of the architect, but of the military engineer. In other parts of Europe also works of this date are comparatively seldom found; nowhere but at Ravenna is there a whole city, so to speak, made up of them. Nowhere but at Ravenna can we find, thickly scattered around us, the churches, the tombs, perhaps the palaces, of the last Roman and the first Teutonic rulers of Italy. In the Old and in the New Rome, and in Milan also, works of the same date do exist; but either they do not form the chief objects of the city, or they have lost their character and position through later changes. If Ravenna boasts of the tombs of Honorius and Theodosius, Milan boasts also, truly or falsely, of the tombs of Stilicho and Athaulf. But at Milan we have to seek for the alleged tomb of Athaulf in a side-chapel of a church which has lost all ancient character, and the tomb of Stilicho, though placed in the most venerable church of the city, stands in a strange position as the support of a pulpit. At Ravenna, on the other hand, the mighty mausoleum of Theodosius and the chapel which contains the tombs of Galla Placidia, her brother, and her later husband, are among the best known and best preserved monuments of the city. Ravenna, in the days of its Exarchs, could never have dared to set up its own St. Vital as a rival to Imperial St. Sophia; but at St. Sophia, changed into the temple of another faith, the most characteristic ornaments have been hidden or torn away, while at St. Vital Hebrew patriarchs and Christian saints, and the Imperial forms of Justinian and his strangely-chosen Empress, still look down, as they did thirteen hundred years back, upon the altars of Christian worship. Ravenna, in short, seems, as it were, to have been preserved all but untouched to keep up the memory of the days which were alike Roman, Christian, and Imperial.

The great monuments of Ravenna all come within less than a hundred and fifty years of each other, and yet they fall naturally into three periods. First come the monuments of the Christian Western Empire, the churches and tombs of the family of Theodosius. Next come the works of the Gothic Kingdom, the churches and the mausoleum of Theodosius. Lastly come the buildings, St. Vital among the foremost, which are later than the recovery of Italy under Justinian. It follows then that two great historical revolutions come within the range of the Ravenna monuments. One of these revolutions clothes the monuments of the second class with an absolutely unique interest. The Gothic monuments of Ravenna—at Ravenna we must call back the word “Gothic” from its secondary to its primary meaning—are the earliest civilized monuments of our own race. They are the only monuments of that illustrious branch of our race—a branch, be it ever remembered, nearer to us than to our High-German kinsfolk—to whose lot it fell to be the first Teutonic masters of Italy. The brilliant episode of the Gothic Kingdom—that most brilliant time of it when

Theodoric gave Italy such a season of rest and prosperity as she had never had since the days of the Antonines, such as she has never had again till our own times—all this lives at Ravenna in brick and stone, while from the rest of the world it has utterly passed away. The churches of Theodoric too have an interest of another kind, as the earliest monuments of religious equality. In claiming them as the first monuments of our own race, we may be inclined to forgive them for being the first monuments of heresy. But, as such, the churches of Theodoric, raised for the worship of his Arian Goths, mark one of those rare moments in the history of the world when a wise and impartial ruler compelled contending sects to live in peace side by side. The policy of the great Goth was far wiser than that of the Arian Emperors who had reigned before him. Constantius and Valens were persecutors of the Orthodox; Justinian demanded of St. Ambrose the surrender of a church in Milan for the heretical worship. Theodoric made no such mistakes; he gave no such opportunities to his enemies. He in no way persecuted the Catholics; he in no way disturbed them in their possessions; but, with a wisdom of which was not seen for ages after, he simply set up the worship of his own sect on terms of perfect equality with theirs.

The reign of Theodoric—λόγω μὲν τύραννος, says Procopius, ἔργῳ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἀληθικός—save the dark events with which it begins and ends, is like a kind of dream, like the romantic ideal of a beneficent ruler turned by some spell into true history. But, great as were the events which lie within the range of the Ravenna monuments, all come together under one head; they are all Christian Roman. The architecture of the reign of Theodoric—the only existing Gothic architecture in the literal sense—does not differ from the style of the earlier and later buildings of the same class. There was no reason why it should. Theodoric was King of the Goths, but he ruled in Italy as a vicegerent of the absent Emperor, and throughout his reign the preservation and imitation of the works of earlier Roman art was a chief object of his care. So again we must remember that the recovery of Italy by Belisarius and Narses was strictly a Roman reconquest. Belisarius himself was Consul of the Republic when he sailed for Sicily. One of the Ravenna inscriptions speaks of the “Pax et Libertas” which were restored to Italy by the overthrow of the Gothic rule. We may perhaps think that the rule of a Gothic King was likely to be more favourable to peace and freedom than the rule of a Byzantine Exarch. Such was not the mind of the sixth century. Nothing had yet happened to give the Empire anything but a Roman character. Caesar Augustus might dwell at the New Rome, not at the Old, but that was simply as in former times he had dwelled at Milan or at Ravenna itself. The Empire was none the less Roman for any of those changes. The official speech was still Latin, as the mighty volume of the Civil Law remains to bear witness. At St. Mark's we see the Byzantine influence after Byzantine influence had become Greek influence. Greek inscriptions appear over the heads of the holy personages in the mosaics. But the walls of St. Vital and St. Apollinaris in Classe speak no tongue but Latin. Whatever may have been the native speech of the peasant from the foot of Haemus, Imperator Caesar Flavius Justinianus Augustus could, as such, acknowledge no tongue but that of his predecessors.

And now for a few words on the monuments themselves. They are mainly ecclesiastical. There is indeed one noble fragment of early domestic work in the so-called Palace of Theodoric. Whether the existing building can claim to have really been the dwelling-place of the great Goth has been strongly called in question, and we must confess that we share the doubt. There seems no reason to doubt that it is older than Charles the Great, and that it served largely as a quarry for the pillars which he carried off to adorn his palace at Aachen; but we are inclined to attribute it to the days of Lombard rather than of Gothic rule. The works of Theodoric are Roman; this palace is not Roman but Romanesque, though undoubtedly a very early form of Romanesque. We can hardly persuade ourselves that the great arched-headed doorway can belong to Theodoric's age, when doorways were still square, and when the tympanum itself had not begun to appear. But it is manifestly akin to much of our so-called “Anglo-Saxon” work. The tower-arch of St. Bene't's at Cambridge is plainly a rougher example of the same class. But, if we have not reached the actual home of the great Goth, we have at least reached a spot where we are driven to look on the great Frank as a modern intruder and destroyer. We have somewhat of the same feeling as we walk through the room in the archiepiscopal palace where so many of the inscriptions of Ravenna are carefully preserved. We pass by some inscriptions of heathen times with less attention than we should give them elsewhere; our eye is caught on one side by a Latin inscription to a Chamberlain of the Gothic King, and on the other by the Greek epitaph of a later Byzantine Exarch, which tells us—truly or falsely—how the army of the Italians (*rō πράτευμα τὸν Ἰταλῶν*) wept for him. These are genuine memorials, such as Ravenna alone could supply; but when we see among them a dedication “Karolo Regi Francorum et Langobardorum et Patricio Romanorum,” the titles which elsewhere would call forth reverence here raise a certain feeling of incongruity, and we are half inclined to say “Friend, thou hast no business here.” We look with more interest on the arcade in the market-place formed of pillars and capitals strangely put together, but on one of which is a monograph out of which ingenious men have spelled the word “Theodoricus,” and which may be a memorial of the Gothic King, as it may be a memorial of some meaner craftsman.

The mention of the Archbishop's palace leads us to an easy division of the ecclesiastical buildings of Ravenna into two classes, those which follow the cruciform and domical, and those which follow the basilican type. But it must be added that in both classes the glory of the Ravenna churches is to be sought for wholly within. The early Christian buildings had no means of producing a striking exterior. The elder architecture did so by means of the colonnade, and the basilica had taken the colonnade indoors. The Ravenna buildings, built mainly of brick, have but little to show without; to make the outside worthy of what it contains was reserved for the men of Pisa and Lucca at a later day. But go within, and few things are more striking than the long ranges of columns, the spoils of heathendom, varying, it may be, slightly in height and size, often supporting capitals of various forms, but still joining in a true harmony to bear up the endless ranges of arches in which the lowest stage of the mediæval minster already begins to be prefigured. The triforium, clerestory, and vault are things yet to come, or they are at most represented by a few windows pierced in the upper part of the wall with but little reference to the arches below. But the basilica has its own substitute. We do not lack the triforium of Modena or Norwich or Pisa or Durham itself, as we gaze on the glorious series of mosaics which occupy its place in the basilica of Theodoric, the misnamed St. Apollinaris, the church which the Gothic lord of Ravenna reared for his countrymen and fellow-believers. Few of man's works are more magnificent than that long procession of triumphant virgins headed by the Three Kings—not stiff conventional forms, as in the later Byzantine work, but living and moving human beings—bearing their gifts to their Lord on the knees of His mother. This splendid church is indeed the noblest of all; but it is only one out of the examples of this date which Ravenna, alone among the cities of the earth, sets before us in such abundance. One of the finest, St. Apollinaris in Classe, lies far out of the city, a witness to those changes in the relations of land and water which form the history of Ravenna. The one relic of Clasian now is this magnificent abbey, with its sixth century basilica and parts of the conventional buildings seemingly of the same date. For they are built of the same genuine Roman brick as the church itself, while the brick of the campanile is of a smaller and later kind. The distinguishing campanile of Ravenna, as of Ireland and East-Anglia, is round. The Ravenna towers have a rougher and earlier look than the square towers, but this may partly be owing to their shape, partly to the practice of largely blocking up the windows. Still there can be little doubt that, though additions to the original basilicas, they are early additions, probably of the days of the Lombard rule. We climb that of St. Apollinaris in Classe, in the hopes that the Adriatic, in its various fallings back, has not absolutely retreated beyond our sight. What can be seen and what cannot be seen from any given point must always be matter to be decided only by considerable experience. We can only say that, when we had the chance of making the experiment, the eye ranged over marshes and rhines and over

Ravenna's immemorial wood,
Rooted where once the Adrian wave flowed o'er.

It caught distant hills which clearly had water between them and Ravenna, but the sea itself was not to be seen from the new station whither man had so vainly followed it.

We see no reason whatever to doubt the early date commonly given to the Ravenna basilicas; but it is clear that in some places they contain portions of buildings earlier still. In the church of St. Agatha, towards the west end, arches of Roman brick have been cut through to make way for the columnar arcades, and though this change may have been made in the fifteenth century, it marks the former existence of something earlier than the existing basilican forms.

The baptisteries, which at Ravenna, as elsewhere in Italy, stand distinct from the churches, form the natural transition to the domical and cruciform buildings. The archiepiscopal chapel, though the smallest, is not the least interesting, by reason of its exquisite early mosaics. The famous chapel and tomb of Galla Placidia eminently illustrates the way in which at Ravenna all attractions are to be looked for within. From without, the building is hardly to be seen; within it is rich with mosaics, and the interest of its contents is not lessened by the personal insignificance of the persons commemorated. We seek in vain for the tomb of Trajan or Diocletian, of Constantine or Theodosius; but Honorus sleeps undisturbed in his sister's chapel, so does her Roman husband Constantius—her nobler Goti lies far away at Milan. In tombs of this date Ravenna is specially rich. The sarcophagi of early Christian times lie about in the churches and in the streets, and they have often been freely used by men of later ages as their own resting-places. The crowning glory of this class of objects has been at least spared this indignity; but the bones of Theodoric, as those of a heretic—perhaps as those of a barbarian—were soon cast out from beneath his mighty monolith dome. The very name of the hero has been exchanged in popular speech for one which simply describes the form of the building. *La Rotonda* stands distinguished as the one building of Ravenna built wholly of stone; but it is stone from distant Istria, whence came also the gigantic block—now unluckily broken—which covers the whole. Of domical churches proper, not being also tombs, the chief is of course the grand pile of St. Vital, the model of Aachen. That again, in its shapeless brick outside, gives little promise of its sublime interior, its cupola, its columnar galleries, and the glo-

rious mosaics which look down on its high altar. One thing however is lacking; the wretched paintings which disfigure the cupola, and which, by imitating architectural forms, mislead the eye in following the lines of the building, may well be displaced, if possible, by mosaics, or, failing that, by honest whitewash. Outside the building stands a sepulchral monument such as could be found nowhere but at Ravenna. It is the tomb of an Exarch of Armenian birth, sent from Constantinople to bear rule over Italy. With this we will wind up our list of Ravennese antiquities. The place has associations of later date; but in the presence of the tomb of Theodoric and the tomb of Dante we have no mind to tarry by the column which commemorates the death and the useless victory of Gaston of Foix.

DEFECTIVE SANITARY ARRANGEMENTS.

THE clamorous agitators of the Alliance might usefully explain what they expect the working-man to drink when they have deprived him of his beer. They never seem to consider that many parts of England have by neglect of sanitary precautions been brought to a condition nearly resembling that of those districts of Holland and Belgium where drinkable water does not exist. We have heard that recently in a village of 200 or 300 inhabitants there were 39 cases of typhoid fever, resulting in 18 deaths; and this outbreak of disease was undoubtedly caused by the percolation of sewage into a well which was the only source from which the inhabitants could obtain water. The Board of Guardians, who in rural districts act as a Board of Health, would not take upon themselves to close this well, although the expense cast upon the parish by sickness and death must have far exceeded the cost of digging another well at proper distance from the houses of the afflicted village. Those who are well acquainted with the condition of the small towns and villages of England will confirm our statement that the water drunk in them is in many instances drawn from soil which in the course of years has become imbued with the sewage of adjoining houses. There is no power to compel that which both science and experience prescribe, and an ordinary Board of Guardians has not the least notion of spending five pounds in order to save fifty. It is wonderful when we hear so much about the rights and duties of the working-man that it should be impossible to protect him against imbibing poison. If the Alliance would expend 100,000*l.* in supplying the poor with wholesome water, they might more reasonably ask us to consider their proposal for depriving the poor of beer. Even the advocacy of Mr. Scott Russell could not prejudice the demand for water undefiled by sewage, nor would Conservative peers hesitate to adopt the principle that artisans are entitled to protection against preventable disease.

The public mind has been painfully attracted to a subject which usually receives much less attention than it deserves. Sanitary arrangements both in town and country are grievously imperfect, and they will never be improved until Government obtains from the Legislature and exercises power to compel the observance of necessary rules as to water-supply, drainage, and ventilation. We invite the attention of the Alliance to the statement which we deliberately make that more people are killed in England by drinking water than by drinking beer. Indeed, the process of poisoning by infused sewage has gone on for many years, but its victims have only lately been counted. Water may be polluted either by permeation of sewage from a cesspool to well, as happens in many villages, or by impregnation with sewage-gas, by means which are in unsuspected operation in many town houses. Let us suppose that a covered cistern exists for the water supply of a house, and that this cistern is provided as usual with a waste-pipe communicating with the main sewer. This communication is of course trapped; but a trap is liable to get out of order, and besides an accumulation of gas in a sewer will force any trap that has been or can be made. The gas passing up the waste-pipe into the cistern impregnates the water if the cistern is closed, or the air if the cistern is open. In the former case the inmates of the house drink, and in the latter case they breathe, poison. It is possible and desirable to supply a house with water for drinking purposes without a cistern; but even if this be done, there are probably one or more water-closets in the house, and these, when formed on the ordinary plan, are never-failing conductors of poison among the household. The water-closet necessarily communicates with the sewer, and, supposing traps to fail or be forced, gas passes up this communication, and diffuses itself through the house when doors and windows are closed during the hours of night. The remedy for this evil would be to continue the pipe which passes from the sewer to the water-closet upwards through the roof, so that the ascending gas may rise to a point where it would be innocuous. Yet we believe that this simple precaution has been adopted in very few houses; and if its adoption is allowed to depend on architects and builders, things will remain as they are for another twenty years. But if some such arrangement is necessary, there ought to be an authority able and willing to compel it to be made. Waste water from a sink ought to discharge itself outside the house by a pipe with open mouth, so that such pipe may not become a conduit for sewage-gas; but as the pipe of a water-closet cannot have an open mouth, it must be prevented from becoming dangerous to health by having an open top rising above the roof. Unless these matters receive attention, the cost and labour of perfecting a system of drainage are worse than thrown away. Filth

is discharged and noxious gas received in exchange for it, and perhaps that which is most offensive is least injurious. Mr. Corfield, a recent writer upon the treatment of sewage, says, "It does not necessarily follow that that which ceases to be disagreeable may not continue to be dangerous." The water supply and drainage of a house may be to ordinary observation perfect, and yet a poisonous gas may be infusing itself into the water of a cistern which is drunk daily by an entire family. It would be easy to produce cases in which this pollution of drinking water has never been suspected until an outbreak of typhoid fever has drawn medical attention to the sanitary imperfections of the house in which it occurred. The disposal of sewage has now been taken up in large towns as a duty that can no longer be evaded. But impervious pipes conducting to sewage farms at a safe distance from habitations are only a part of the machinery that must be provided. If these pipes become a laboratory of poisonous gas ready to diffuse itself through unprotected houses, the last state of our town population will be worse than the first. As regards our rural population almost nothing has been done, and therefore it may at least be hoped that when action begins it will not take a wrong direction.

There is a remarkable unanimity of medical and engineering testimony to the dangers which beset the upper and middle classes of society from the imperfection of arrangements intended to promote health and comfort. It is difficult to decide whether the permanent town residence or the house hired for a few weeks at the sea-side is more fraught with peril to the occupants. The reports which have been published by the *British Medical Journal* and the *Lancet* on the sanitary condition of Londesborough Lodge appear to remove all doubt as to the origin of the fever which attacked the Prince of Wales and Lord Chesterfield. The construction of the Lodge supplies in perfection all the conditions necessary for the propagation of a virulent and insidious poison. The house is ill-built and difficult to ventilate, and has thirteen communications with two large cesspools. Immediately below the cabinet of the bedroom occupied first by the Prince of Wales and afterwards by Lord Chesterfield, and directly connected with it by a long pipe, is a cesspool which receives the drainage of six closets, and which has not been opened for at least six years. The cesspools empty themselves into sewers which are subject to great backward pressure from the influence of the tides as well as from strong currents of air. The consequence is that the house, with its thirteen sewer openings and its cesspools beneath, is exposed to frequent and dangerous inundations of sewer-gas. Moreover the accommodation of the Lodge appears to have been inadequate for the crowd of people who were collected there at the time of the Prince's visit. Three maid-servants slept in a room only 6 ft. 10 in. high, and the Prince's valet in a room only 6 ft. 4 in. high, while another attendant had to sleep in a sort of housemaid's closet. If this is true, the wonder is not that two of the guests should have suffered, but that the whole party were not attacked by fever. A writer in the *Times* describes what he calls a break-down of the sanitary appliances of lodging-houses at Scarborough. According to this writer, the offensive effluvia thus produced cause sickness or diarrhoea, but not fever. It is bad enough, however, to go to the sea-side for health, and get instead of it an ailment which is only weakening, but not dangerous. Probably when people began to go to the sea-side they acted under the belief that they would take back thence to their crowded homes a bodily vigour which would help them to contend against the depressing influences of town life during the ensuing year. But this belief appears to have become antiquated. At some sea-side places not only the houses, but even the sea itself, lies under suspicion of impurity. The new town of Scarborough is fairly drained, but the old town is not drained at all—it is described as "a mass of midens and ash-holes and bad stenches." It is not surprising that old Scarborough has this season never been free from low fever. At Brighton there are one or more pipes traversing the beach, and supposed, by the local authorities, to convey the sewage of the town so far out into the sea as to make its return into proximity with the shore impossible. Another writer states that at Windsor eleven or more years ago the poorest and lowest part of the town escaped a visitation of typhoid fever which was very fatal in good houses. The difference lay in this, that while the better houses were all connected with the sewers, the poor part of the town had no drains, but made use of cesspools in the gardens. The same writer gives advice which we think would be excellent but for two objections—first, that it is disagreeable, and secondly, that it is impracticable. He denounces "the unclean and dangerous fashion" of laying on sewer-gas by means of pipes up to our very bedroom doors, and urges that "all these things" should be banished into the open air. Unfortunately, in many London houses there is no open air to speak of, and the habits of the present generation demand certain conveniences in immediate juxtaposition, not only with bedrooms, but also with eating and working rooms. The newest part of the Temple has been built so as to provide a water-closet in each set of chambers. This perhaps is not dangerous, but only disagreeable. Probably, if a new college were built at Oxford or Cambridge, each undergraduate would be supplied with a similar convenience. English travellers in France and Germany are eloquent in their complaints of the imperfect arrangements of the hotels; but it begins to appear that the difference between ourselves and foreigners is only that which existed between Pharisees and ordinary Jews. Even "the body-and-soul stinking town of Cologne" is not perhaps a more unwholesome place than Scar-

borough in the hottest months of the year, when the houses are overcrowded with inmates, and "a break-down" happens. It is surely a wonderful result of supposed sanitary improvement that fever, which was formerly associated with the low-lying, poor quarters of towns, has now been transferred to the eminences chosen as the abodes of wealth and luxury. In ancient times in Italy death was said to visit equally "pauperum tabernas regumque turres." In the nineteenth century in England the power of money is enormous, but it has not yet purchased for its owners immunity from disease, and sometimes it seems to enhance their danger.

THE LEGAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION.

THE movement in favour of a scientific training for lawyers is making very satisfactory progress. In little more than a year the "Legal Education Association" has become a powerful body, widely supported alike by the Bar and by the attorneys, and in communication with the Universities and other learned societies throughout the kingdom. It is especially fortunate in having at its head Sir Roundell Palmer, a champion who knows so well how to unite the *suaviter in modo* with the *fortiter in re*. His speech at the first annual meeting of the Association, in the Hall of the Middle Temple, while most conciliatory towards the venerable institutions the interests of which he might seem to be attacking, was full of well-grounded confidence in the approaching triumph of his cause. The Association has not been idle during the year which has elapsed since it has been fairly in working order. Its objects have been made known to every member of either House of Parliament and of the legal profession in England. Communications have been opened with the Universities and with the Incorporated Law Society, and the other Societies of solicitors in London and the provinces; negotiations have been carried on with a Joint Committee appointed for the purpose by the four Inns of Court; and Sir Roundell Palmer has "broken ground," as he expresses it, in the House of Commons, by moving two resolutions, which, though they came too late in the Session for serious discussion, have fully answered the purpose of putting the question plainly before the country. The vital principles of the Association may be said to be two. In the first place, that no person should be admitted to the status of barrister who has not passed a satisfactory examination in law; and, secondly, that a general school of law should be organized in London, where the very best teaching should be open to all, whether studying with a view to the Bar, or to practise as solicitors, or merely to acquire the knowledge which should be deemed indispensable to the lay magistrate or the legislator.

If the Association were dissolved to-morrow, it would not have existed in vain. One of the two principles for which it contends has already been conceded. The Joint Committee of the four Inns of Court has just yielded so far as to recommend that henceforth no one shall be called to the Bar who has not passed an examination. A reproach which has long attached to English advocates will thus be removed. Our Bar has indeed always maintained a reputation for being a society of gentlemen; and those members of this society who have succeeded in getting and holding practice have ever been honourably distinguished for forensic skill, and occasionally for black-letter learning. But the Bar, as such, cannot be said to have been, what the advocates in most other countries are, a body of jurists trained to regard legal questions from a scientific point of view, and in accordance with methods elaborated by the gradually-matured wisdom of many nations and many centuries. The result is seen in our ignorance of the law as a system, and in our lamentable incapacity for its amendment. The merely empirical knowledge of even our learned lawyers astonishes the foreign jurist, and has been deplored by Committees of Parliament and Royal Commissions. The solicitors have for thirty years prevented the intrusion into their ranks of incompetent persons by a carefully devised system of examinations; and now we are at length assured that the degree of barrister is to imply not only that its holder is a man of honour, but also that he has acquired a knowledge of the science of which he is a professed interpreter. What amount of knowledge will be thus implied is, of course, a different question. Mr. Dicey, on the one hand, in an able article in *Macmillan's Magazine*, expresses his opinion that the standard must necessarily be a low one; the present Solicitor-General, on the other hand, though by no means an unconditional supporter of the Association, is in favour of a "searching and thorough" examination of all candidates for admission to the Bar. We believe that Mr. Jessel is right, and that the experience of all the States of the Continent shows that a high standard of knowledge among advocates may be successfully insisted on.

Although the first object of the Association may now be regarded as attained, its second object—the organization in London of a complete course of legal education, for the benefit of all who choose to profit by it—is still a subject of debate. There are actually persons who deny altogether the value of oral instruction in law; so at least one may infer from the following choice paragraph culled from a legal journal:—"It must be remembered that a large proportion of the students for the Bar have already undergone University training, and that nearly all have passed the age of twenty before they have even seen the inside of *Williams on Real Property*. Their brain has begun to ripen, and they no longer require the milk of oral teaching, being able to devour the strong meat of learned books." The writer evidently sup-

poses that there exist in England learned books upon law fit to put into the hands of a student. It is true, as Mr. Jessel oddly puts it, that education may be obtained not only "in a magnificent lecture-room illuminated by a thousand gas lamps," but also "in a garret by the side of a rushlight." It is, however, no less true that a knowledge of law might be acquired under the guidance of a really competent lecturer in a quarter of the time, and with an expenditure of a quarter of the energy, which would be wasted by the solitary student in poring over such books as have hitherto been written upon the subject.

There is no doubt that an overwhelming majority of the profession and of the public go with the Association upon this point, and fully appreciate the assistance to be derived from lectures and classes in the study of law. Such objections to the scheme of the Association as deserve attention are directed rather to details than to the scheme itself. The Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association, for instance, objects to a too intimate connexion between the proposed central examinations and the proposed metropolitan law professorships, and protests against any monopoly of legal teaching being conferred upon the metropolitan law school. Nothing, however, of this sort is intended by the Legal Education Association, which is only anxious to have a thoroughly qualified and independent Board of Examiners, ready to gauge and attest knowledge wherever acquired—whether at the old Universities, or at such classes as have recently been formed at Manchester and Liverpool, or in the doubtless more complete courses of instruction which could be given by the proposed body of professors in London. We agree with the Legal Education Association in believing that if the governing Senate of the metropolitan law school were sufficiently recognised as a State institution, and contained representatives, not only of the Inns of Court, but also of the Universities and of the Law Societies, it might well be trusted to appoint both examiners and professors, and to see that recognition of merit by the examiners in no way depended upon attendance at the lectures of any particular set of professors. The Education Association has not even expressed an opinion that a student need show that he has attended courses of lectures anywhere. We confess that we should be inclined to insist upon this, and we think there need be no difficulty in devising methods of ensuring that such attendance should be something more than a form.

The University of London seems to be debarred from joining heartily in the work of the Association by a jealousy of the existence in London of another body entitled a University, and empowered to grant degrees. With the objection to the name we have considerable sympathy. We are of course not unaware that many of the greatest Universities were originally founded only in one Faculty, and even that the law students at Padua were constantly described as constituting a *Universitas juristarum*: but we are also mindful that so loose was at one time the use of the term that *omnes Christi fideles* were addressed in public documents as *Universitas vestra*, and that "University" has acquired, by the custom of Europe, a distinct meaning as that species of corporation which teaches all, or the principal, branches of learning. The term "Faculty" is equally current throughout Europe in the sense of a body of teachers and graduates in a special branch of learning; and we cannot conceive of any better phrase than "Faculty of Law" to express what it is now proposed to establish under the style of a "University or general school." Whether the testimonial of fitness which would be conferred by such a Faculty should be called a degree, or a licence, or a diploma, is of minor importance; but we may observe that the Inns of Court were in the habit of conferring titles indicating legal proficiency for centuries before the University of London was heard of; and they were, indeed, described by Lord Coke as "the most famous University for the profession of law only, or of any one branch of science, that is in the world, and advanceth itself above all others, *quantum inter viburna cypressus*." The course of legal study fostered by the examinations of the University of London is probably the very best now in operation in this country, but, even as the University of the metropolis, she can hardly claim to subordinate herself or to forbid the creation of a new Faculty of such imperial importance that its degrees would be the sole passport to the Bench and to practice at home, and to the majority of judicial posts in India and the colonies.

A more serious difference of opinion exists with reference to the persons to whom the proposed courses of lectures should be thrown open. The Joint Committee of the Inns of Court are understood to have resolved, by a small majority, in opposition to the separate Committees of the Middle Temple and Gray's Inn, that it is not desirable that the education of students for the Bar and the education of the articled clerks of solicitors and attorneys should be under one joint system of management. On the other hand, the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association are as unyielding in the other direction, and insist not only that the course of instruction, but even the examination, should be "the same for all students, without reference to the branch of the profession with which they may ultimately connect themselves." The resolution of the Incorporated Law Society is much to the same effect. Now, while we are convinced by the example of Scotland that there is no valid reason why future barristers and solicitors should not meet in the same lecture-rooms, we venture to think that it would be a fatal policy to require the two classes of students to pass precisely the same examinations. Although many branches of law may be profitably studied by both classes of students, yet there are branches which are more useful to one class than to the

other. It must also be remembered that the students for the Bar are a very small class compared with the articled clerks. The latter therefore cannot fairly be subjected to so stringent a test as might reasonably be imposed upon the former. Nor, again, would it be right that the examinations for young men most of whom have passed through a University, and whose average age is perhaps twenty-four, should be lowered to what would be suitable to youths whose average age is perhaps nineteen. An obvious and desirable compromise between the opposing views would be that all students should be allowed to attend in common just such classes in the general law school as they might find suitable to their wants; but that either the law school itself, or the bodies exterior to it and having control over the Bar and the solicitors respectively, should require that persons intending to become solicitors should obtain one degree or certificate, while those intending to practise at the Bar must obtain a different one. There should of course be nothing to prevent the intending solicitor from superadding to the degree necessary to enable him to practise such other, and presumably higher, degree as would be indispensable to a barrister.

The advantages of throwing open the courses of study to all comers are tolerably obvious. A numerous body of students is favourable to the rise of that enthusiasm for their subject which should inspire alike the professor and his class. Really able teachers are more easily attracted to an institution on a large scale; and in such an institution alone is it possible so to map out the whole field of labour as to ensure that each topic shall be thoroughly discussed by some one who is completely master of it. We regret therefore that the Inner Temple has adopted a policy of isolation, and has determined to found tutorships for the benefit not even of all students for the Bar, but only of students of the Inner Temple. This retrogression, as Sir R. Palmer calls it, from the University to the collegiate system, can only be regarded as a temporary expedient. The Inner Temple cannot stand alone against that determination to found a great school of law which gains strength every day. The Law Societies are resolute; the old Universities are anxious to co-operate; the Middle Temple and Gray's Inn wholly approve of the movement; and when that tetracephalous body, the Joint Committee of the Inns of Court, knows its own mind, it will probably be found on the same side. In the meantime the Association are sanguine of obtaining the support of Government, and Sir Roundell Palmer will renew his motion on an early day after the meeting of Parliament.

A FREE-LOVE HEROINE.

ALTHOUGH we are at times rather sorely tried by our shrieking sisterhood at home, a certain Lucretian satisfaction may perhaps be found in contrasting their comparatively tame and decent behaviour with that of the wild women of the Western Continent. If some of our countrywomen occasionally display a morbid fondness for unsavoury subjects, and propound some startling doctrines, their views of feminine freedom and independence fall far short of those which are advocated by Mrs. Victoria C. Woodhull, who is now lecturing on "Free Love" to large audiences in the United States. At Steinway Hall, New York, some three thousand persons, it is computed, were present at her lecture. It is stated that the substance of the address will not bear repetition, and that in this country it would be suppressed under Lord Campbell's Act. Mrs. Woodhull is reported to claim "an inalienable, constitutional, and natural right to love whom I may, to love for as long or as short a period as I can, and to change that love every day if I please." It must be admitted that the privileges of free love could hardly be asserted in more explicit or more comprehensive terms. It is a prosaic and literal rendering of Tristram's song:—

New life, new love, to suit the newer day;
New loves are sweet as those that went before;
Free love—free field—we love but when we may.

Not only, Mrs. Woodhull holds, is the community not entitled to interfere with this right, but it is bound to protect her and her sex in the exercise of it. "I trust," she added, "that I am fully understood, for I mean just that and nothing else." We are afraid there is no possibility of mistaking Mrs. Woodhull's meaning, and perhaps it is as well, if free love is to be preached at all, that it should be proclaimed in the plainest and most outspoken language, so that there may be no misapprehension as to what it implies. An attempt has been made by an English writer to give a romantic and poetical version of the vagaries of the free lovers, glossing over the more repulsive aspects of the subject, and suggesting an impression of primitive and simple innocence. It cannot be said that Mrs. Woodhull encourages any illusions of this kind. Walt Whitman himself could hardly be more frank and uncompromising in his defiance of social conventions, or in his assertion of the supremacy of instinct and passion. Indeed it appears that the lecturer went rather too far for her audience at Steinway Hall, and that her too candid and glowing confessions created some disorder, which was increased by an altercation between herself and one of her sisters who was seated in the body of the hall.

It will be gathered from what has been said that Mrs. Woodhull is no ordinary woman, and this impression is fully borne out by a sketch of her life which has been written by one of her admirers. Mr. Theodore Tilton, who was the chairman at Stein-

way Hall, is also Mrs. Woodhull's biographer; and it is difficult to say which most excites our amazement—the lady's career, or the manner in which it is described. Those who have read George Sand's Memoirs will recollect the amusing emphasis with which she insists upon the *solidarité* of hereditary qualities as an explanation and justification of personal eccentricities. After the account which is given of Mrs. Woodhull's family, one can scarcely be surprised at anything this lady might say or do. She is stated to be the seventh of ten children of Roxana and Buckman Clafin of Ohio. She was christened Victoria after the Queen of England, who was crowned just before she was born; and her biographer appears to be under the impression that the Queen ordained a gift to all her namesakes of that year, and hints that Mrs. Woodhull has some thought of visiting Windsor, and claiming the endowment to which she believes herself entitled. Her mother is described as "an eccentric old lady, compounded in equal parts of heaven and hell." She will pray till her eyes are full of tears, and "in the same hour curse, till her lips are white with foam." The father "exhibits a more tranquil bitterness, with fewer spasms." He had a habit of keeping a number of plaited willow or walnut twigs in a barrel of rain-water, and with these he used to chastise his family, occasionally varying the discipline with a hand-saw or a log of firewood. Mrs. Clafin has been from her youth a religious monomaniac, and her husband is also subject to similar excitements. It is charitable to accept the suggestion, if this description of him is true, that pecuniary losses unsettled a naturally morbid and ill-balanced mind. Such are the two parents whose commingled essence, Mr. Tilton assures us, constitutes the spiritual principle of his heroine. The children would appear to share the peculiarities of the parents. They are described as a sisterhood of furies, tempered with love's melancholy. "Here and there one will drop on her knees and invoke God's vengeance on the rest." They are also remarkable for their sloth and greed, and for the ingratitude which reviles the hand that feeds them. "It is the common law of the Clafin clan that the idle many shall eat up the substance of the thrifty few," of whom Victoria is one. Mr. Tilton admits that he is a little rough in speaking of this remarkable and not prepossessing family, and attributes it to "a rude prejudice in favour of the plain truth." It may be assumed that Mrs. Woodhull, in whose honour the pamphlet is written, shares the prejudice, and has no objection to having her family held up to public odium in this manner. It would appear that free love does not begin at home. Victoria's youth was passed in drudgery and unhappiness, but—"here," says her biographer, "I must let out a secret"—she was cheered and assisted by the spirits. From her childhood down to the present time she has been in constant communion with the angels. She does just what they direct her to do; she writes and speaks directly from their inspiration. "In pleasant weather she has a habit of sitting on the roof of her stately mansion on Murray Hill, and there communing hour by hour with the spirits." When she was a child the spirits used to be so obliging as to do her lessons for her at school, carry her basket, and ply her spade in the garden. The chief of her spiritual acquaintances is described as "a matured man of stately figure, clad in a Greek tunic, solemn and graceful in his aspect, strong in his influence, and altogether dominant over her life." For years he came to her almost daily, but would never divulge his name; at length he took her into his confidence. Appearing suddenly, he wrote on the table, in English letters, the name of "Demosthenes." The biographer, who professes to be very cautious in what he says, and to give only facts which are quite beyond doubt, will not express any opinion of his own as to the reality of this inspiration, but he goes so far as to say that if Demosthenes could arise and speak English he could hardly excel this "talented woman in her glowing hours." All Mrs. Woodhull's compositions are said to be dictated by the spirits, Macaulay, it is suggested, occasionally helping on Demosthenes; and as she repeats the words, lying in a trance, her husband writes them down for publication. An extract which Mr. Tilton gives as "not unworthy of Macaulay" is rather hard on the historian, who would certainly have done something dreadful to his schoolboy if he had found him writing anything like this as a prose exercise:—"It is again true, also, that to some minds there is a consonant harmony between the idea and the word, so that its euphonious utterance seems to their imaginations to be itself a genius of success."

Demosthenes, it appears, had predicted to Mrs. Woodhull that she would emerge from poverty, and live in a fine house, conduct and publish a journal, and become the ruler of her people. He intimated that if she went to 17 Great Jones Street, New York, she would find a handsome house ready for her reception; and she had no difficulty in discovering the house, and has installed herself there. All the predictions have come true, with the exception of the last, which Mrs. Woodhull has already taken steps to realize by nominating herself for the Presidency of the United States at the next election. From household drudgery she passed to the stage, which, notwithstanding her success, she soon abandoned for the more lucrative business of a spiritualist medium. By the help of the spirits she wrought miraculous cures, detected robbers, and told fortunes. These tricks paid better than acting, and in one year she gained, it is said, a hundred thousand dollars. But in 1869 the spirits made her give up her practice as a medium—perhaps a more prosaic explanation is that she and they were played out by this time—and she then took to lecturing on free love, and publishing a newspaper which is the organ of the movement. We gather from Mr. Tilton's

pamphlet that an uncharitable world has credited Mrs. Woodhull with acting up to her professions, and practising the license which she advocates. Her biographer is anxious that it should be understood that she has only two husbands, and that though all three occasionally live under one roof, she was legally divorced from the first husband in Indiana, and has only admitted him to her table out of charity; indeed, it was her second husband who, when he heard of his predecessor's distress, himself brought him to the house. Mrs. Woodhull's first marriage is said to have taken place when she was only fourteen years of age, and it was her husband's brutality and repeated infidelities which led her to meditate on the consoling doctrines of free love, and to work out the theory of unrestricted liberty which she is now preaching. Mr. Tilton is shocked at the wickedness of the people who repeat or believe scandalous stories about the immaculate Victoria, though he partly consoles himself with the reflection that even King Arthur's "white blamelessness" was once accounted blame. It may be suggested, however, that a lady who goes about proclaiming the remarkable opinions which we have already quoted can scarcely be surprised that there should be a disposition to believe that she is ready to practise what she preaches, and that her residence with two husbands at a time, coupled with her well-known views, should give rise to unpleasant suspicions. The vehement assertion of a right is usually supposed to imply a desire or intention to take advantage of it; and there would seem to be an obvious inconsistency in one who justifies a daily change of husbands resenting as an insult the supposition that she does not hesitate to avail herself of the liberty which she claims. Mr. Tilton does not forget to give us a description of his heroine's personal appearance, which he has carefully studied from several points of view. Looked at over the left shoulder, her side face has a perfect aquiline outline; but if you look at it over the other shoulder, the lines are irregular, and the front face is broad, with prominent cheek bones and some unshapely nasal lines. It will be understood that her beauty is that of expression, rather than feature. We are assured that this remarkable person, who writes like Macaulay and talks like Demosthenes, can also ride a horse like an Indian, climb a tree like an athlete, row a boat, play billiards, and "walk all day like an Englishwoman." Perhaps, however, her most remarkable accomplishment is that, in the midst of slander and injustice, "she beats her daily gong of business and reform with notes not musical, but strong." It is a startling trait of American versatility that a lady who has been a spiritualist medium, and who goes about lecturing on free love, should also carry on a bank as well as a newspaper; but it is possible that Mrs. Woodhull finds the notoriety which she has acquired not unprofitable as an advertisement of her commercial speculation.

THE TRAINING OF THE BRITISH SOLDIER.

WE lately expressed an opinion that it was probable that the rank and file of the British army would henceforth be composed of men differing very widely from their predecessors. The conditions of service having been considerably changed, it is only natural to expect that the description of men who accept them will be changed likewise. Not very long ago the soldier's engagement was for life; a little later it was shortened to twenty-one years, then to ten, and a few months back to six years. Nor can we be certain that the limit of shortness has yet been reached, for it is generally believed that Mr. Cardwell is anxious that a further reduction to three years should in time be made. There are both advantages and disadvantages in short service, and we shall recur to the question a little further on. We fear, however, that, possessed as we are with the mania for a servile imitation of the Prussian system, even a medium length of service is doomed. What we have to do therefore is to make the best possible use of the three or six years which, for ninety men out of a hundred, will be the duration of their military career proper—*i.e.*, in the active army. It is obvious that a system of training which answered very well in the days of long service may, under a changed condition of affairs, prove utterly unsuitable. Change in length of service evidently involves a change in the method of training. What that method should be is the question to which an answer is urgently required.

Before attempting to give a reply it is necessary that we should first of all determine what are the results which we wish to achieve. In our opinion those results are three in number:—Mechanical proficiency in military duty; intelligence in its discharge; and such habits of discipline and obedience, such involuntary performance of evolutions, as shall survive the most severe trials. Mechanical proficiency is, though the most important, yet the most easy of attainment of all the three results to be aimed at. An intelligent performance of military duties and drill is less easy to secure, as it is not a matter of routine. The third result, which may be briefly described as moral force, is the least easy of all to achieve. Yet, without it, success with regard to the first two objects is comparatively valueless. Let us consider each of these points separately. Under the old system, when a lifetime was spent in imparting and keeping up a knowledge of drill, the mechanical proficiency of the British soldier was remarkable, and was the admiration of all foreign nations. The young soldiers were in an insignificant minority, and were not put into the ranks until they had undergone a long and severe training. Lately we have somewhat fallen off in this particular, and the deterioration is chiefly due to the increased

proportion of recruits and the interruptions to drill caused by the variety of the instruction imparted to the soldier. The uninitiated will learn with surprise that the training of a private soldier of infantry comprises the following subjects:—Ordinary drill, rifle instruction and practice, great-gun exercise, military telegraphy, field engineering, swimming, gymnastics, bayonet drill, and running drill. We do not say that the course is carried out in its integrity, or that every soldier is expected to be a proficient in all these matters; still any soldier may be, and practically many soldiers are, called on to master them. In addition to all this, commanding officers are directed to encourage the occupation of soldiers in trades. It will be seen therefore that the theoretically perfect training of a soldier is an arduous undertaking. We do not deny that a knowledge of many of these things is essential, and a knowledge of all of them desirable; but we must remember that in military, as well as in other affairs, we must cut our coat according to our cloth. We must not try to cram into three, or even six years, an amount of training which can only be properly imparted in ten or twelve. Such being the case, we ought to endeavour to ascertain what portions of our present training might, without practical detriment, be reduced or even got rid of. We submit that military telegraphy is not the proper province of the line soldier, and should be relegated to a special and distinct corps. Rapidity and proficiency in this branch demand long training and constant practice. If we accord the required time, we trench on the demands of the regimental authorities, and impair the efficiency of the soldier as regards his primary duties. If we do not, we obtain men only imperfectly versed in telegraphy, and but indifferently drilled as infantry soldiers. Again, it is not often in real war that an infantry soldier is called on to work artillery, and when he is, only the most elementary knowledge is called into play. We would suggest, therefore, that merely elementary instruction should be imparted. Further, as regards field engineering, it is desirable that the officers should possess a perfect practical acquaintance with the subject; and it might be an advantage if the pioneers were required to go through a regular course at Chatham. As to the rank and file, it would be quite sufficient if they knew how they should be distributed in working parties, and how to make gabions and fascines. Skill in the use of the rifle is indispensable; but though there has lately been a slight improvement in this matter, yet the instruction is still imparted in an unnecessarily tedious and quasi-scientific manner. The present bayonet drill is simply ridiculous. It is in the *salle d'armes* alone that the soldier can be really taught the best method of using his favourite arm. With reference to ordinary drill, it might with much advantage be considerably shortened and simplified. But few evolutions, and those only of the most simple nature, are ever practised in battle. Why learn any others which take up time to master, are difficult to remember in action, and only serve to make a show at a review? The less the soldier has to learn the more thoroughly will he be master, the more certainly will he remember, his lesson.

We now come to the second result which we should seek to achieve—namely, the intelligent discharge of duty and performance of drill. Till lately the soldier was taught to believe that, as the *Rejected Addresses* say, thinking was a waste of thought. "You thought, sir; you thought; and pray what business had you to think?" is a remark that has thousands of times been addressed by an officer to a soldier. It was deemed desirable to convert the soldier into a component part of a machine, and the fact that intelligent is worth twice as much as unreasoning obedience seems to have been a recent discovery in the British army. We are wiser now, and have at all events learnt one useful lesson from the Prussians. Intelligence without discipline is a doubtful good, but combined with discipline it is invaluable. We now theoretically recognise this truth, and are convinced that brilliant success in the field can only be gained by the intelligent co-operation of every unit, however humble, in carrying out the designs of the general. Our convictions, however, have as yet borne no fruit. To achieve any practical result we must completely change our system of instruction, and in the first place we must secure competent instructors. Our non-commissioned officers are, generally speaking, admirable drills, and quite fitted to take the rough edge off a recruit; but that is all. The instant mere mechanical knowledge has been mastered, a higher class of instructors is required to give meaning to the lessons and show their application. Why should not this class consist of the officers? They are supposed to train their men; but in reality they do little more than manœuvre them. It has been urged that the duties of a drill sergeant are derogatory to the British officer, and that he is not so well qualified to perform them as is a non-commissioned officer. We cannot discover how it would be derogatory to an officer to render his soldiers efficient, and thus to act up to the terms of his commission. The Prussian officers are as aristocratic as any in the world, yet they do not disdain to impart a knowledge of the goose-step. We have even been told that in order to make certain that no ingrowing nail impairs the marching powers of their men, they make a periodical inspection of feet. Surely, after such a precedent, British officers cannot pretend that it is beneath their dignity to impart the more advanced lessons to their soldiers. As to want of fitness for this duty, we can only say that officers who are not found qualified ought to be invited to resign their commissions. Much may also be done, and is indeed already being done, to develop the intelligence of soldiers by means of education, which should aim rather at calling forth

a man's powers of judgment, comparison, and reflection than at driving into his head arithmetical formulæ and a dry list of countries and capital towns. Lectures also of a suggestive nature would be very useful. As to those which are given now and are illustrated by magic-lanterns, they are for the most part childish affairs suited rather to children than men. The word children reminds us that it is as children that we have invariably treated our soldiers. Far from acting in this manner, we should encourage habits of reliance, self-dependence, and helpfulness. We should seek to induce men to think, and rule them rather through their understandings than their fears, relying upon moral influence rather than on a blind mechanical discipline.

As regards moral force, its importance cannot be overrated. Individual skill, courage, and intelligence are worthless without moral force, which is the complement of military efficiency. From the conduct of army reformers generally we might almost suppose that they disbelieved in its existence. The Prussians believe in and cultivate it, and it is probably as much to this circumstance as to superior organization and skill that their recent astounding victories over the French must be attributed. Moral force is made up of many constituents, which are seldom all present at the same time. But, in the first place, what does the term signify? We believe it may be accurately defined as being that force in a body of men which tends to overcome personal fear and the effect of discouraging circumstances. An army composed of men individually brave will often succumb to another army whose members are possessed of less personal courage but more moral force. Of course, without a certain amount of individual courage, moral force produces but a feeble effect. Its constituents are—patriotism, sense of duty, *esprit de corps*, pride, enthusiasm for, or hatred of, a particular cause, religious fanaticism, revenge, confidence in leaders, and, above all, long service, perfect training, and strict discipline. In the confusion and perturbation of battle a soldier's mind is not very clear, nor is there any time for reflection. Obedience and action, therefore, should be prompt, independent of thought, almost of will. The soldier under such circumstances should do the right thing, obey the slightest sign or order, mechanically and involuntarily. Obedience should be as natural to him as it would be to raise his hand to ward off a blow at his head. He should also have perfect trust in his officers, and unhesitating reliance on the support of his comrades. There should be no looking to the right, left, or rear to see if he is duly accompanied or followed. There should be an absolute conviction that every one is doing his duty, and that he himself is not being exposed to needless danger. All these results, however, are only to be obtained by constant association and prolonged and constant training.

We deduce from these considerations that short service is in many respects injurious to the active army, though it may be apparently economical as regards the country. The object of military organization should be, in the first place, to make the active army efficient; in the second, to supply it with reserves; and in the third, to get the best fighting article at the lowest possible price. This order is apparently inverted by Mr. Cardwell. As, however, long service seems to be doomed, it becomes necessary to turn the short period of training sanctioned to the best possible account. We have already indicated some of the ways in which this can be done. We have pointed out that drill should be simplified, that the soldier should be first of all rendered perfect in his primary duties, and then taught such simple military accomplishments as may be considered desirable, and that his attention should not be distracted nor his memory loaded by a host of lessons not likely to be often put in practice. We would even suggest that the principle of division of labour should be applied to light infantry work, and that special rifle regiments, or picked men in ordinary line battalions, should generally be assigned to this duty. Small time is given to ordinary training; that time should not therefore be dissipated on a variety of subjects. A recruit can in six months fit himself, as far as regards mere knowledge of drill, to take his place in the ranks, but we require something more than knowledge—namely, such practice as will cause him to perform his duty with mechanical certainty and precision. And we may take this opportunity of protesting against inducing soldiers to learn trades while serving. The arguments on the other side are specious, but prove worthless when closely examined. It is desirable, no doubt, that every regiment should be, to use a Scotch expression, self-contained. But this might be accomplished by attaching to each regiment, after the manner of France and Prussia, a detachment of workmen. A soldier who learns a trade while serving provides a livelihood for himself on discharge, and thus saves the country the expense of a pension. With short service, however, the trade would be learnt at the expense of his military efficiency, and the result would be the presence in the ranks of a large number of men equally indifferent as soldiers and as artisans. We try to accomplish too much, and conduct our training in a desultory manner. Let us first render our soldiers perfect in the military duties of their own branch, and then employ any residue of time which may remain in other instruction. Instead of pursuing this plan, we strive to combine in one body a professional army and a National Guard. Such a system must lead to failure, and, though apparently based on economical considerations, will indubitably be found in the long run to be the most expensive.

CATTLE-BREEDING.

THAT which we still call the Cattle Show has become a huge exhibition and bazaar, in which everything connected nearly or remotely with cattle-breeding and agriculture finds a place. This exhibition resembles that which was held at South Kensington in being also a bazaar, but it differs in lasting only for five days, and also in the circumstance that the exhibitors do their own puffing, instead of having it done for them by authority. The spacious hall in which these exhibitions have for some years been held is not at all too large for them, and the progress of scientific farming will probably demand even more extensive accommodation in future years. The galleries of this hall, crowded with specimens of seeds and roots, and with implements and machinery, attest even more strongly than the sleek and comely animals on the ground-floor the wonderful enlargement which the minds of English farmers have lately undergone. These farmers are supposed not only to use artificial manures, but to understand their operation; and all questions which arise in managing stock or land are discussed in periodicals which have established themselves for the instruction of a class of men who formerly read nothing but a county newspaper. Farming, as one of these periodicals remarks, has now become "a commercial and scientific pursuit," and indeed it has almost become a profession. Lectures on artificial manuring are delivered before farmers' clubs, and improvements are constantly announced in the application of steam to agriculture. Among discussions of every point that can concern breeders of stock, we have found one "On the Proper Touch of a Well-Bred Beast," which furnishes a good example of the literature of farming. We are told that the touch may be good or bad, fine or harsh, hard or mellow. A perfect touch will be found with a thick loose skin, floating, as it were, on a layer of soft fat, yielding to the least pressure, and springing back towards the fingers like piece of soft thick chamois leather, and covered with thick glossy soft hair. The sensation derived from a fine touch is pleasurable and even delightful to an amateur of breeding. "You cannot help liking the animal that possesses a fine touch." Along with it is generally associated a fine symmetrical form. A knowledge of "touch" can only be acquired by long practice; but, when acquired, it is of itself sufficient means of judging of the feeding quality of the ox; because where there is a fine touch, the properties of symmetrical form, fine bone, sweet disposition, and purity of blood are the general accompaniments. Another curious example of bucolic literature is the *Quarterly Record of Shorthorn Transactions*, which is published regularly. Besides setting forth the births and deaths of shorthorns during the previous three months, the compiler devotes some space to an obituary notice of eminent breeders. He writes of shorthorned cattle and of breeders in connexion with them as the late lamented "Druid" wrote of racehorses and the noblemen and gentlemen who had been honoured by possessing them. He does not exactly speak of the late Mr. Eastwood as the man who belonged to Master Butterfly, but he evidently contemplates his death as a "shorthorn transaction" of the year. He bestows "a few words" on Sir John Rolt; but the newspaper which gives an abstract of his circular does not inform us how far that eminent lawyer had entitled himself to be commemorated among cattle-breeders. As he had a seat in Gloucestershire, he had the opportunity of indulging all the rural tastes which are usually strong in Englishmen who have made fortunes by town labour, and it may be suspected that he would have valued a prize gained at a cattle show almost as highly as the early successes of his professional career. The large prices paid for well-bred shorthorns may perhaps cause the keeping of them to be regarded as a luxury, but it appears rather to be a business in which the skilful employment of capital affords good returns. It is, however, doubtless an advantage that among cattle-breeders are some to whom an immediate return is not important. In this point of view agriculture derives unquestionable benefit from the existence of large estates, and this benefit extends from England over the whole world, as may be seen by examining the list of exportations of shorthorned cattle for the year. Twenty animals of good breed have left this country for America; twenty-six have taken the longer journey to Australia; Canada is debited with a total of fifty-four; while Germany has received six. The best herds in the kingdom have been largely drawn upon, and we find among the exporters several peers, as well as men whose names indicate that their possession of the means to become successful breeders is to be ascribed to their own industry and intelligence. We are told that Mr. Richard Stratton, who lately died, was most particular in his selection of bulls, and his custom was to spend a month or six weeks in looking over various stocks for the male animal, selecting him not so much for his great beauty and symmetry as for his character, blood, and the excellence of his sire and dam. Mr. Stratton had won over 5,000*l.* in prizes, and five gold medals had come to him from the Smithfield Club alone. He has frequently sold his animals at high figures for Australia, and three of his bulls went to colonial purchasers at 400 guineas, 470 guineas, and 600 guineas respectively. "He studied and practised breeding for the animals' sake more than for fashionable tastes. He went for sound constitutions, good quality of flesh, and abundant milking properties. He looked to pedigree, not for its long descent, but to assure himself that the immediate ancestors were good, and of a family of good animals."

We have made this quotation because it suggests several remarks which we think useful. Mr. Stratton was evidently

a man of great natural aptitude for the business which he pursued with unremitting diligence, and thus he became a cattle-breeder of world-wide celebrity. His common sense and experience led him to a conclusion as to the value of aristocratic blood which Republican agitators may do well to ponder. In men as well as in shorthorned cattle a pedigree is valuable as showing that immediate ancestors were good, and of a good family. The Earl of Derby, for example, owes his influence in the country not only to his own ability and industry, but to the fact that he is his father's son; and that fact would have weight, not only in England, but in the most remote of England's colonies, and it could not be attenuated by any quantity of lectures on the blessings of a Republic. Englishmen in general like political or military leaders who come of what cattle-breeders would call "a good sort." Of course they are, or ought to be, like Mr. Stratton, who would have recruited the strength of his herd from any quarter, regardless of fashionable taste; but then they would desire to possess Mr. Stratton's judgment in selection. Republican agitators may also usefully observe that when a man rises, as Sir John Rolt did, from being a shopboy to the highest eminence at the Bar, his notion of enjoying the rewards of successful labour is to buy an estate and breed shorthorned cattle. In a country where such tastes prevail among its leading minds Republicanism must be very uphill work. Another remark suggested by these "Shorthorn Transactions" is that the connexion between this country and her colonies is made up of many various types. We supply the colonies with law, or rather we should do so if the perversity or stinginess of Government would allow an efficient Court to be maintained for the hearing of colonial appeals. We also supply the colonies with bishops, and we maintain a Church which, besides its utility at home, is valuable as affording a standard of doctrine and discipline to which colonial Churches may conveniently adapt themselves. And further, we furnish colonial cattle-breeders with animals of approved blood, taken from herds to which successive owners have applied all the resources of wealth, judgment, and experience. It is possible that a peer of long descent might attach too high value to pedigree in a shorthorned sire; but a peer who breeds cattle is necessarily influenced by the ideas of other cattle-breeders, who are obliged to consider, not fashion, but utility. The late Mr. Adkins, who produced a new variety of down sheep, owed his success as a breeder both of sheep and cattle to the practical character of his mind. By pursuing a system of judicious crossing, "he succeeded in making tups fed from mangold and hay at a year old weigh from twenty to twenty-five pounds per quarter—a very good weight. Along with size he secured compactness, hardness, and uniformity." We are told in reference to another eminent breeder of shorthorns that "three or four sales at different periods disseminated the surplus stock at fair prices through the district, to the great improvement of the neighbouring herds." A breeder of the highest skill may make his transactions so profitable as to benefit the district in which he lives while building up a fortune for himself; but agricultural improvements have generally been commenced by men who could wait some time for profit, and even endure loss, or, in other words, by men who had either inherited or amassed fortunes. It would not be just to Mr. Mecham to say that he farms out of the till; but we do not think that English agriculture would have reached its present point of excellence unless many experiments had been made in stock-breeding and manuring which were not and could hardly be expected to be immediately remunerative.

One of the most important questions of the day both in an agricultural and sanitary point of view is that of the utilization of town sewage, and some of the principal landowners of the country are taking the lead, as might be expected, in experiments requiring command both of land and money. The show of roots grown upon a sewage farm at Romford was an important feature in the Hall, and we can perceive by glancing over agricultural publications that the management of such farms attracts yearly more and more attention. Indeed, if farming be regarded as a scientific development of the producing power of land, every available means of increasing that power is likely to be eagerly pursued. Sewage contains fertilizing elements, and the only difficulty is to bring them into contact with poor or exhausted land. All methods hitherto proposed of manufacturing solid manure from sewage may be pronounced failures, and sewage in a liquid state can only be applied to land in the immediate neighbourhood of the town which produces it. But nobody can observe the energy and ingenuity of agriculturists as exhibited in the Cattle Show without feeling confident that this difficulty will be overcome. The immense popularity of the Show, which has attracted fifty thousand visitors in a day, is an encouraging proof of the sympathy which unites town and country in England. It is also satisfactory to observe that successful farmers attain to political and social eminence. Indeed a farmer nowadays can hardly succeed in his business without so much education as enables him to hold his own at a public meeting, or even in the House of Commons. It may be inferred from a visit to the Cattle Show that every Englishman would like to be a landowner, and all landowners are more or less Conservative. Thus an inspection of the champion of the Hall, a white shorthorned ox, bred by the late Mr. Richard Stratton, may reconcile philosophers to the production in the same age and country of Sir Charles Dilke.

REVIEWS.

THE LAST TOURNAMENT.*

THIS poem, which is to be placed among the *Idyls of the King*, between *Pelleas* and *Guinevere*, is an expansion or illustration of a well-known passage in Arthur's address to Guinevere:—

And all this throve until I wedded thee,
Believing, "Lo, mine helpmate, one to feel
My purpose, and rejoicing in my joy."
Then came thy shameful sin with Lancelot;
Then came the sin of Tristram and Isolt;
Then others, following these my mightiest knights,
And drawing foul ensample from fair names,
Sinned also, till the loathsome opposite
Of all my heart had destined did obtain,
And all through thee.

The same theme had been partially treated in the unpleasant tale of *Pelleas*, and it had been illustrated both directly and by contrast in the fanciful asceticism of the *Holy Grail*. In the *Last Tournament* the whole fabric of Arthur's society has fallen into utter confusion, by the universal prevalence of licentiousness, by the dissolution of loyalty and discipline, and by the helpless ineptitude of the blameless King, who, in spite of dim suspicion and vague dissatisfaction, persistently maintains his solitary blindness to the transparent scandal of his Court. It is perhaps unlucky for the first generation of readers that the order of composition or of publication has not coincided with the natural sequence of the poetic narrative. Posterity will more fully appreciate the moral dignity of Arthur in his visit to Amesbury, and the mythical picturesqueness of his parting with Sir Bedivere, after labouring through the imbecile embarrassments of the foolish *Pelleas*, and through the distracted anarchy which is described in the *Last Tournament*. It will be found that the language also rises with the occasion, nor will there hereafter be any trace of the anti-climax which unavoidably causes dissatisfaction in the present day. In this respect the *Last Tournament* is on the ascending slope, richer in colouring and more imaginative in detail than the poems which it follows in the series, though the personages and events, probably of deliberate purpose, fall short of the elevation of the grand figure who rode to the final battle while

more and more
The moony vapours rolling round the King,
Who seemed the phantom of a giant in him.
Enwound him fold by fold, and made him grey
And greyer, till himself became as mist
Before her, moving ghostlike to his doom.

A poem, although it may be produced by instalments, ought to be regarded as a whole, and a great artist is the best judge of the shades and gradations which are required to give full effect to his composition; but in the *Last Tournament*, as in some of the later *Idyls* and in *Enid*, the effect is somewhat impaired by the perceptible influence on the poet of long familiarity with the earlier versions of the legend. Lord Lytton's hopeless failure to revive the fable was not needed as a proof that King Arthur and the Round Table are in the present day the creation and the exclusive property of Mr. Tennyson. In accordance with the immemorial practice of poets, he dealt with existing materials, but the half-forgotten story which he reproduced owes all its interest to modern inspiration. It would seem that the poet himself, by the natural tendency of association, has acquired a kind of fondness for the worthless vehicles in which he found the subject of his labours. In *Enid* he reproduced an unmeaning and tiresome episode apparently because it had amused him, and in the *Holy Grail*, in *Pelleas*, and to a smaller extent in the *Last Tournament*, he has been led to dwell more largely than might have been expected, though always as a moralist or censor, on the topics which were almost exclusively treated by early storytellers, from the minnesingers and troubadours to Boccaccio and his Italian and French imitators. English dramatists at the end of the seventeenth century, and French novelists of the present day, have not less sedulously concentrated their attention on the subject of conjugal infidelity; but in the Ages of Faith vice had two sides, almost equally objectionable, as it was regarded with secular tolerance and sympathy or with the artificial horror of monastic morality. It was natural that Mr. Tennyson's authorities should represent conventional abnegation as the only alternative of the worldly practices of Lancelot and Tristram; but the story of the *Holy Grail* would have been less unreal if all the Percivals and Galahads had not been Hermits or monks scarcely manlier than nuns. There is no stronger proof of the degradation and corruption which are produced by the false and enervating ethics of the cloister than the habit of dwelling on an accidental, negative, and irrelevant quality as the distinctive ornament of infancy and childhood. It would be as natural and as reasonable to admire a little child for not being a murderer or a fraudulent bankrupt as on account of its necessary exemption from the temptations and failings of King Arthur's intriguing knights. It is of course only for a dramatic purpose that Mr. Tennyson adopts in some parts of the poem the artificial and unwholesome morality of a bygone time; but there seems to be little advantage in his adoption of the tone which was natural to early fabulists.

* *The Last Tournament*. By Alfred Tennyson, Poet-Laureate. *Contemporary Review*, December, 1871.

The original historians of the *Last Tournament* complied with the fashion of the day in attributing to a celebration of the memory of a child the character of a festival of Innocence, though it might with equal propriety have been called a festival in honour of commercial integrity. It would have been easy for the poet who confers on the legend all its worth and meaning to detach his narrative from the perversions which belonged to a dissipated society, a feeble and unwholesome literature, and a Fakir-like religion. Arthur's fool, who, like all the conventional fools of fiction, is the satirist of the Court, sneers at

The twelve small damsels, white as Innocence,
In honour of poor Innocence, the babe,
Who left the gems which Innocence the Queen
Lent to the King, and Innocence the King
Gave for a prize;

and Sir Tristram might have answered that the jest, such as it is, is founded on a quibble between innocence ironically used for guilt, and for genuine innocence or simplicity. The same unwillingness to desert the old version of the legend may be traced in the occasional introduction of archaic or euphuistic phrases which jar unpleasantly on ears which would rather listen to Mr. Tennyson than to forgotten rhapsodists of some uncertain century. The most obnoxious of these eccentricities is the use of the obsolete pronoun "ye" for the second person singular, nor would it be easy to devise any contrivance of equal minuteness which would so effectually disturb the enjoyment of a modern reader. Such words as "tonguesters," for garrulous or gossiping persons, though almost equally annoying, are more sparingly introduced; and happily in the greater part of the poem Mr. Tennyson is not a copyist of a worthless model, but, as of old, an original master of pregnant thought and harmonious language.

The *Last Tournament* forms an introduction to the death of Tristram, and to the discovery of Lancelot's relations with the Queen. The dead child in whose honour the jousts were held had, after the ordinary fashion of those times, been found by Lancelot in an eagle's nest, wearing a ruby necklace which now was offered by Guinevere as a prize. The King, absent on an adventure, desires Lancelot to preside over the lists; but the day is stormy, the contest is slack; and Lancelot, absorbed in his own thoughts, fails even to enforce the laws of the tournament. Many of the knights shrink from encountering Sir Tristram, who easily wins the prize, and Lancelot murmurs that the glory of the Round Table is no more. The ladies, offended with the courtesy of the victor, who tells them that his Queen of Beauty is not there, reproduce Lancelot's lamentation for the departed glory of the Round Table. In the afternoon Tristram departs for Tintagel, somewhat perplexed as to the best manner of breaking to Queen Isolt of Cornwall his recent marriage with Isolt of the White Hands or of Brittany. The awkwardness is removed when he ascertains that King Mark had already told Isolt of the marriage. The obnoxious husband had left the castle for three days' hunting,

as he said.
And so returns belike within an hour,
Mark's way, my soul,

and the lovers converse in comparative security. The lady presses for a renewal of Tristram's amorous vows; but at Tintagel, as at Camelot, he recurs without self-deceit and without repentance to the knightly oath which he had already broken:—

I swear no more—
I swore to the great King, and am forsworn ;
For once, even to the height, I honoured him.
"Man ! is he man at all ?" methought, when first
I rode from our rough Lyonsse, and beheld
That victor of the Pagan thronged in hall,
His hair, a sun that rayed from off a brow
Like full moon high in heaven ; the steel blue eyes,
The golden beard that clothed his lips with light .
Moreover that weird legend of his birth,
With Merlin's mystic babble about his end,
Amazed me ; then his foot was on a stool
Shaped as a dragon ; he seemed to me no man,
But Michael trampling Satan. So I swore,
Being amazed.

But now the epicurean license which had succeeded to the chivalrous austerity of the Round Table is to be followed by the final tragedy of the Order and of the whole generation. While Tristram, the second knight in rank and valour to Lancelot, is making his peace with Isolt by the gift of the ruby necklace, his own fate is impending :—

He rose, he turned, and flinging round her neck,
Claspt it ; but while he bowed himself to lay
Warm kisses in the hollow of her throat,
Out of the dark, just as his lips had touched,
Behind him rose a shadow and a shriek—
"Mark's way," said Mark, and clove him through the brain.

At the same time the fatal secret of Camelot is developed on the return of Arthur from his expedition. The grief of Dagonet, who communicates the tidings to his master, is pathetic enough to atone for a certain tediousness in his previous sarcasms. Wordsworth, with tender subtlety, observed that grief for the dead was saddest to "the man of mirth," and in the same spirit the jester recognises the contrast between his now extinct vocation and the ruin which has fallen on the King:—

That night came Arthur home, and while he climbed
All in a death-dumb autumn dripping gloom
The stairway to the hall, and looked and saw
The great Queen's bower was dark, about his feet

A voice clung sobbing till he questioned it,
"What art thou?" and the voice about his feet
Sent up an answer, sobbing, "I am thy fool,
And I shall never make thee smile again."

The next scene will be the flight of Guinevere to Amesbury, and the parting visit of Arthur. It would not be difficult to explain away the entire poem, which is now probably complete, into the moral allegory which Mr. Tennyson once or twice indicates as an incidental or secondary purpose; but in the process of ethical analysis poetry has a tendency to evaporate. Mr. Tennyson has been often badly treated by incompetent critics; but even the late article in the *Quarterly Review*, by a writer who judges of poetry as a deaf man might judge of music, is scarcely more irritating than the applause of blundering admirers who irrelevantly dilate on the excellence of the poet's moral teaching. The portrait of a good man is not necessarily a good portrait, nor are the fifty thousand sermons which on every Sunday expound the admirable doctrines of Christianity for the most part works of genius. Truth of form, and not truth in the subject-matter, is the distinctive characteristic of art. It is an absurd libel on the *Idylls of the King* to regard them as a superfluous gloss on the Seventh Commandment, although the effect of domestic laxity in dissolving the bonds of political society, as it has often been proved by historical experience, may be a suitable theme for a poet. It was not as a propounder of copybook maxims of morality that Mr. Tennyson acquired his fame, or that he sustains it in his later works. His unrivalled command of metre would of itself be a more satisfactory proof of a marvellous poetic faculty than his moral orthodoxy. The two songs which are introduced into the *Last Tournament*, as into each of the other Idylls, are composed in that measured or lyric blank verse of which Mr. Tennyson discovered and retains the secret. The second is sung by Tristram to Isolt immediately before the fatal blow:—

Ay, ay, O ay—the winds that bend the brier!
A star in heaven, a star within the mere!
Ay, ay, O ay—a star was my desire,
And one was far apart, and one was near;
Ay, ay, O ay—the winds that bow the grass,
And one was water, and one star was fire,
And one will ever shine, and one will pass!
Ay, ay, O ay—the winds that move the mere.

To those whose indolence shrinks from the pleasant labour of solving the poetic riddle, it may be suggested that the star and its reflected image respectively represent the ideal perfection of the Round Table and the more accessible attractions of companionship with Isolt. The mere and the breeze which stirs it are the easy nature of Tristram yielding to transient impulses of passion and inclination. Other plausible interpretations might perhaps be devised, and the song itself is infinitely preferable to any prosaic explanation of its meaning.

FORSTER'S LIFE OF DICKENS.*

WE imagine that so experienced a writer as Mr. Forster must be fully conscious of the difficulties which beset his present undertaking. He is certain indeed of a large body of readers who will receive with eager curiosity all that he has to tell us about the most popular author of the day. And yet to gratify that curiosity without trespassing upon the necessary reticences of private life, so soon after the occurrence of the events related, is an exceedingly delicate problem. The external incidents of Dickens's career were of course not very exciting. One unbroken series of successes, each rising higher than the last, so far at least as circulation is a sufficient test of success, is pretty much all—with an exception or two upon which we shall touch directly—which the biographer has to record. The real interest of the biography must depend upon the skill with which the inner life and character of its subject are brought before us, and made to illustrate his literary performances. In spite of the obvious difficulty of performing such a task so as to satisfy all the necessary conditions, success has been obtained in similar instances. Besides the immortal Boswell, Lockhart's Life of Scott is a case in point. But we should hardly have been much surprised if Mr. Forster had failed in his enterprise, and given us a book to which indeed future literary historians would be bound to refer, but which would speedily cease to have any great interest for general readers.

On the whole, we may say that our more favourable anticipations, which for these reasons were not of a very sanguine character, have been fairly realized. There are considerable faults in the book; and we certainly cannot accept it as destined to add one more to the brief list of thoroughly satisfactory biographies. Still it contains some really interesting materials, and the general spirit and design are creditable. There is a certain tendency, almost unavoidable under the circumstances, to the biographer's besetting sin of excessive admiration; and the portrait is not quite so vivid as we might have hoped. We will, however, begin by noticing those parts of the book which in our opinion deserve to be read by all who enjoy Dickens's writings. These are chiefly the first two and the last six chapters. They are devoted respectively to the description of Dickens's early boyhood, and to the record of his impressions of America on his first visit. Both of them help us to understand more clearly some of the most remarkable parts of his earlier writings. The second chapter is especially interesting, and is founded chiefly on an autobiographical fragment. There was, as we are told, one period of his childhood to which Dickens looked back with a horror which to persons of less sensitive nature seems rather exaggerated. He was for a year or two employed in a blacking-warehouse. The physical suffering and the moral and social degradation made so deep an impression upon him that he says at the end of the fragment, "I have never, until I now impart it to this paper, in any burst of confidence with any one, my own wife not excepted, raised the curtain I then dropped, thank God." He adds that he never had the courage to revisit the place of his servitude; that for years he went out of his way to avoid certain smells and sights which reminded him of his sufferings; and that his "old way home by the Borough made him cry after his eldest child could speak." We will not give quotations, which our readers have probably seen elsewhere, as to the details of this time of misery. It is curious, however, to remark how many of the most interesting scenes in his novels are reflections of scenes then witnessed. Parts of *Oliver Twist*, of *Dombey and Son*, of *Pickwick*, of the *Old Curiosity Shop*, and many of the scenes in *David Copperfield*, are autobiography thinly disguised. The same may be said of many of the ablest writings of almost all our most eminent novelists. But that which is specially characteristic of Dickens, and is a striking proof of his extraordinary powers of observation, is that the autobiographical part of his novels should refer to so early a date. All England was delighted, though without knowing it, by the recollections of a few months of his early boyhood. He tells us that he saw the comic and pathetic side of a certain scene in the Marshalsea, which was repeated almost literally in *David Copperfield*, as vividly at the time of its occurrence as he could perceive it in his mature years. We can fully believe it; for in fact this premature development of the faculty of observation is one of the most characteristic things about him. Nobody, one might say, ever saw so much at the first glance as Dickens. He reminds us of the story told by the conjuror Houdin, who trained himself to remember all the objects in a shop-window whilst simply walking past it. Dickens, we fancy, could have accomplished such a feat without training. The weaker side of his intellect was the failure to penetrate below the surface, or to get beyond the easy commonplaces and the obvious sentiments. Extraordinary precocity of certain talents seems to be naturally associated with a defective development of others; and Dickens to the end of his life was rather a marvellous youth than a full-grown man of genius. The observing power was always out of all proportion to the reflective power.

The chapter in which this early life is recorded is perhaps the most interesting in the volume. The last chapters, however, have also a considerable interest of a somewhat similar kind. We have often thought that the American scenes of *Martin Chuzzlewit*, though not altogether pleasant, are perhaps the most surprising literary feat which he ever performed. They are of course a caricature of American life, or, at least, are a description of a very ugly and an exceptional side of America. And yet they are so vivid that we should be forced to admit, even in the absence of any direct testimony to the fact, that they were a close approximation to at least one part of the truth. The letters published in this volume are in parts supplementary to the *American Notes*, but they show us more unreservedly the impression made upon Dickens at the time, and help us to conceive the state of mind of which Eden and Hannibal Chollop and the Miss Hominys were the natural issue. Mr. Forster, following Dickens himself, thinks it necessary to make some kind of apology to the American people. We will not reopen a controversy which both parties were desirous to overlook in later years. If Dickens was a little too hard upon the country which had endeavoured to be hospitable to him after its fashion, the offence has been forgiven, and ample apologies have been made. It is, however, plain from these letters, and we do not see any cause for ignoring the fact, that Dickens was driven into a state of intense nervous irritation by his American life. In fact, it was a terribly trying position. He was baited as only a popular lion in America can be baited. If he went to a party he was crowded to death; if he dined out, he had to talk about everything to everybody; if he went to church, the neighbouring pews were crammed, and the sermon was directed at him; if he drank a glass of water, a hundred people tried to look down his throat, and naturally the process became wearisome. Then, in his Western travel, he was tormented beyond description by the spitting, by the overheated hotels and the overcrowded cabins, and the general discomforts of a half-settled country. That a man of exquisitely sensitive nature and immense faculties for humorous observation should come home and write *Martin Chuzzlewit* after this is intelligible enough, and the letters here published explain his feelings admirably, besides being excellent in themselves for their graphic power. Mr. Forster is anxious to tell us that, in spite of all this, Dickens was eager in his recognition of the nobler qualities of his entertainers. He explains his feelings better himself in one of his letters. The Americans, he says, have all kinds of good qualities, which he enumerates; but, he emphatically adds, "I don't like the country. I would not live here on any consideration. It goes against the grain with me." The fact is that, however eager Dickens undoubtedly was to recognise all that was good, his insight was not very profound. He was overpowered by the superficial ugliness, by the absence of the picturesque, and by the monotony and dullness of the country. He says characteristically that "there is not on the face of the earth a people so utterly destitute of humour, vivacity, or the capacity of enjoyment." There is a truth in this, but again it is a superficial truth. He never seems

* *The Life of Charles Dickens.* By John Forster. London: Chapman & Hall. 1871.

to have even thought of seeking for any explanation of the phenomena that surprised him. He does not make allowance for the inevitable dulness in many ways of a newly settled country, where few of the luxuries and refinements of life have yet been introduced. The denial of a sense of humour to the Americans is still more to the point. There is in fact no department of literature where Americans have shown so much originality and power as in their humorous writing. But their humour is of a grim and suppressed variety, which is in curious contrast with the jovial and unctuous humour of which Dickens was so great a master. It was natural that he should fail to appreciate a quality so little in harmony with his own temperament; but it is also true that in this, as in other criticisms, we observe the curious combination of surprising power in catching the first aspect of things with great comparative weakness in detecting anything that lies below the surface. Dickens's view of the American character is incomparably more lively, but scarcely more profound, than that of the first British bagman who might have been travelling through the country with all his natural prejudices fresh upon him. Nobody ever drew a more lively picture with so slight opportunities; but for anything like real insight into the more deeply seated defects or merits of the national character we must go elsewhere.

We may touch more briefly upon the remaining part of the book. It is fairly well done, though there is little of striking interest. We get glimpses of Dickens during his early literary successes, and we have details from which we may form some idea of the extraordinary fertility of his fancy and the unfailing buoyancy of his temperament. We can perceive sufficient indications of the unrivalled animal spirits which produced the *Pickwick Papers*, and wonder at the rapidity with which novel after novel was poured forth when even his productiveness could scarcely keep pace with the demands of the press. In some of his best novels he could never get ahead of the number actually in hand, and yet his imagination never flagged and his energy was never exhausted. Of the man himself we scarcely see so much as we could wish. We are told, and fully believe, that he was most kindly and generous, the staunchest of friends and the most sympathetic of helpers. But here Mr. Forster seems either to have been hampered by a commendable desire not to intrude into private life or to be really unable to draw a vivid portrait. We hear of pleasant rides and walks and convivial dinners and various domestic amusements; but we do not talk to Dickens as Boswell makes us talk to Johnson, or join in his circle as Lockhart makes us to join in the circle of Scott. The letters generally refer to business with publishers, and though they show a characteristic buoyancy and self-confidence, they tell us little of the more intimate feelings of the man. There are, indeed, touches of his characteristic style; but on the whole we cannot call them specially interesting. They are of the objective kind; describing facts or discussing business arrangements, but not throwing much light on the writer's character. It is only natural and creditable that a young man in the full flush of popularity should not care to moralize or talk sentiment; but we fancy that it might have been possible for an intimate friend to raise the curtain a little more without indiscretion. As it is, we have only the external picture of an animated, busy, and successful life, which is pleasant as far as it goes, and shows that if Dickens did not quite escape uninjured from the dangers of popularity, he was at least far less spoilt than could have been anticipated.

We must add in conclusion that the least happy part of the book appears to us to be the criticisms. They consist of almost undiluted eulogy, and that eulogy not of the most discriminating kind. What, for example, is to be said of such a remark as this in defence of *Oliver Twist*?—"It is the book's prominent merit that vice is nowhere made attractive in it. Crime is not more intensely odious all through than it is also most wretched and most unhappy." If nothing more were to be said for *Oliver Twist* than that we should tremble for Dickens's popularity. The "prominent merit" is that of every tract that ever was written. One might as well praise a painter for giving his devil horns and hoofs instead of making him an angel of light. Undoubtedly Dickens labours his bad characters with a will in *Oliver Twist* and elsewhere, and never allows us to doubt for a moment who are his villains or whether they receive ample retribution. From a moral point of view this is doubtless estimable; but it is odd that Mr. Forster should not see that it is precisely one of Dickens's weakest points. The method is radically inartistic, and fails to represent that mixture of vice and virtue, and that inequality in the distribution of happiness and misery, which are the most prominent peculiarities of the world we live in. A writer may be moral without knocking all his villains on the head, and pointing out in every page that vice is detestable and honesty the best policy. There is a pleasant simplicity about Dickens's method; but it does not indicate deep observation of human nature, or much sensibility to those really difficult problems by which more thoughtful natures are tormented. In a similar spirit Mr. Forster of course accepts Dickens's pathos and his social theories at the valuation of his warmest admirers. He does not appear to know that some people think the pathos shallow, and fancy that Dickens often attacked abuses without having really penetrated the questions involved. However, few people will go to a biographer for judicious criticism; we will hope that in future volumes there will be fewer literary remarks, and more vivid portraiture of Dickens himself.

EARLE'S PHILOLOGY OF THE ENGLISH TONGUE.*

THE name of the late Professor of Anglo-Saxon and Editor of the Parallel Chronicles must be known and respected by every one who has the faintest claim to open his mouth on the subject of Teutonic scholarship. None but a man altogether incapable of taking his own measure would think of dealing with Mr. Earle otherwise than as one who is, within the range of his own subjects, entitled to be listened to as a master. Any work of his, though it should afford ground for difference of opinion or even for adverse criticism, will be dealt with by any critic who has not wholly lost his self-respect as a work open, like all other works, to critical discussion, but which any wise critic will think twice before he condemns; and such a critic will at least express any unavoidable censures in that tone of respect with which we remark points of difference, or even positive errors, in men at whose feet we have sat. The man who never heard of Mr. Earle's claims to a respectful hearing shows how small must be the range of his own knowledge; to the man who knows them, but wilfully keeps them out of sight, we should not be wrong in applying harsher words. Yet we can see, both in the present book and in Mr. Earle's earlier writings, certain points of weakness, certain quaint and unusual ways of putting things, certain discursive and irregular tendencies, which scholars accept as something without which Mr. Earle would not be Mr. Earle, but which, as we can quite understand, may afford tempting opportunities for cavil to the smaller fry of dabblers. It has often struck us that Mr. Earle should have stayed in his old place at Oxford. His turn of mind is better adapted for the post of an oral teacher than for that of a writer of books. We have never read any writing of Mr. Earle's in which we did not here and there find matter for a smile. But had we been listening to a lecture instead of hearing a book, the smile would have been a very good-humoured one, one in which the Professor himself would most likely have joined. The way in which Mr. Earle takes his readers as it were into his confidence, his amusing little digressions, the quaint illustrations and familiar anecdotes of which he is specially fond, would often be more in place in a spoken lecture than in a printed book. By these things he certainly lays himself open to cavils; but it must be a puny mind indeed which can see in his whole book nothing but materials for such cavils. In the eyes of scholars these little peculiarities are simply parts of the man, and they amuse without offending.

We have indeed our own points of dispute with Mr. Earle, and one of them meets us at the very threshold of the subject. It is a distinct falling back when a real scholar like Mr. Earle brings up again the well-nigh exploded fashion of speaking of English up to a certain or uncertain date as Saxon. Mr. Earle's words are:—

It has become the literary habit of recent times to use the term "Saxon" as a distinction for the early period of our history and language and literature, and to reserve the term "English" for the later period. There is some degree of literary impropriety in this, because the Saxons called their own language *English*. On this ground some critics insist that we should let the word *English* stand for the whole extent of our insular history, which they would divide into Old English, Middle English, and New English. But, on the whole, the terms *already* in use seem bolder and more distinct. They enable us to distinguish between Saxon and Anglian; and they also comprise the united nation under the compound term Anglo-Saxon. As expressive of the dominant power, it is not very irregular to call the whole nation briefly Saxon.

We need not argue out this point for the ten-thousandth time, but we cannot help asking how the practice of speaking of the whole nation confusedly as Saxons "enables us to distinguish between Saxon and Anglian." This is one of two or three cases in which Mr. Earle shows that he has not fully fathomed the depths of human ignorance. Mr. Earle has been an energetic Professor; we believe that he has never filled the office of Examiner. Because his own ideas are perfectly clear and accurate, because a certain form of words breeds no confusion in his own mind, he does not always stop to think of the confusion which the same form of words may breed in the minds of those who are only half informed. Whatever nomenclature Mr. Earle may use, he uses it quite harmlessly to himself, because, as every page of his book shows, he has thoroughly mastered the history of the English language. But to those who have not thoroughly mastered it the fashion of using "Saxon" and "English" as chronological terms will infallibly convey the idea that "Saxon," instead of being the earlier form of English, was a distinct language which has given way to English, as Welsh has done in Cornwall and Irish in the more part of its own island. No man can be further from such a belief than Mr. Earle, but his unlucky use of a misleading nomenclature will be sure to confirm many in the hazy notions to which that nomenclature has given rise.

At all events it is rather strange when Mr. Earle writes:—

"Old English" is (or was, before there was an Early English Text Society, and before Mr. Freeman had arisen to assign a new meaning to the word English) particularly identified with the language of the fifteenth century.

We should hardly have suspected Mr. Freeman of conspiring with the Early English Text Society, and it is odd to hear that he has given a new sense to the word English. The sense in which Mr. Freeman uses the word English he certainly learned of Dr. Guest, and Dr. Guest learned it of King Alfred.

There are one or two other places in which it is not unlikely that Mr. Earle's way of putting things may help to strengthen

* *The Philology of the English Tongue.* By John Earle, M.A. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1871.

people in mistakes from which he is himself as free as any man. For instance, it is a not uncommon mistake of half-learned people to fancy that English borrowed the plural in *s* from the French. We have known this quoted triumphantly as showing that even the inflexions in English are not purely Teutonic. Such people of course never heard of such a formation as *smið*, plural *smiðas*; still less do they know that the *s* is as truly a Teutonic ending as it is a Greek or Latin one. They are not likely to have looked in Wulfila, and they are most likely misled by the disappearance of the ending in High German. But we have known the thing seriously argued. Now Mr. Earle, when discussing the English plural, very properly points out how the *s* ending, once only one among several, and by no means the most usual, has gradually swallowed up all the others, except in a few words which are now looked on as exceptional. Nor does he forget that the triumph of *s* was not secured without a hard struggle on the part of *n*, and that *n* actually gained, and has kept to this day, one or two plurals to which it had no right. He then goes on to point out the high probability that the triumph of *s* was made more easy by the fact that *s* was the prevalent ending in French. This is very likely indeed; when this sort of struggle is going on, almost any accident may give the victory to one competitor rather than another. But it would have been well to mention that exactly the same process was going on about the same time in the French language itself. While English was choosing *s* as its all but universal plural ending out of several Teutonic competitors, French was making exactly the same choice out of several Latin competitors. A mutual influence of either language on the other is not at all unlikely, and to say that English was influenced by French in its choice of *s* rather than *n* is quite another thing from saying that the *s* ending was borrowed from French. Mr. Earle knows the distinction as well as any man, but by dwelling exclusively on the change in English, and the probable influence of French upon it, without pointing out that an analogous change took place in French also, he gives occasion for the half-learned class utterly to mistake his meaning. We should not be surprised to hear Mr. Earle some day quoted as authority for the doctrine that the English plural ending *s* is one borrowed from the French.

So again, near the very beginning of his book, Mr. Earle illustrates Grimm's law by some examples beyond the range of the Aryan languages. It is quite to the purpose to show that the same kind of interchange of letters which, in our own group of languages, is found between High and Low-Dutch, between Welsh and Breton, is found also between Hebrew and Chaldee. And any fact which shows, or even suggests, a primitive connexion between the Aryan and the Semitic tongues is always worth noticing. Mr. Earle, we feel sure, meant nothing but what is perfectly reasonable and accurate when he wrote:—

The Hebrew word for *rock* is ZORR or TSOOR, after which a famous Phoenician city seated on a rock was called ZÖR, as it is always called in the Old Testament; but this word sounded in Greek ears from Phoenician mouths so as to cause them to write it Tíooç, Tyrus, whence we have the name of *Tyre*. The same word (probably) passing with an early migration westward is found in the Dartmoor *Tors*.

Mr. Earle seems to have forgotten that *Tors* are not peculiar to Dartmoor, but that they are also found, not only in neighbouring Somerset, but in distant Derbyshire. But his meaning no doubt was simply that *Tor* and *Zor* were probably cognate words—a perfectly allowable opinion, though one to which we should decline hastily to pledge ourselves. But nothing is more likely than that careless people may quote Mr. Earle in favour of Phoenician or Hebrew colonies in Cornwall, Marazion, Hannibal Grylls, and what not.

Let us take another example of the way in which Mr. Earle not only may be, but we believe, actually has been, misunderstood. He is speaking of the Old-English feminine ending *en*, answering to the High-Dutch *in* or *inn*, and quotes the word *vixen*, strictly the female fox, as an example of the form which has lived on to our own day. He adds, "not only there is the *-en* termination, but also the thinning of the masculine vowel, as in the Saxon examples above." The "Saxon" examples are *God, gyden, Weah, wylen, pegen, pynen*, and Mr. Earle compares also the High-Dutch forms of the very word in question, *Fuchs, Füchseinn*. It seems that there is a critic so dull as not to see what Mr. Earle means by "the masculine vowel," and who asks what a "masculine vowel" is. To people of this class it is not wonderful that a perhaps solitary example of *Umlaut* in modern English should be puzzling. But to put, whether in jest or earnest, some unintelligible theory of reduplication, something about "*fox-for*," as a parallel to Mr. Earle's account of the word, would seem to imply a degree of perverse ingenuity which we should not have looked for in one capable of blundering in so plain a matter.

And now for our own opinion of Mr. Earle's book. As we have already shown, we sit down to examine it and to criticize it with all due respect for the author's great position as a Teutonic scholar, and with every disposition to shield Mr. Earle's weaker side from all actual or possible scoffers. We have read his book with interest and pleasure, and we hope with profit also. Any one who has already read and thought a good deal on the matter could not fail to learn much from his ever ready and ingenious illustrations. Nor will such a one be disposed to quarrel, for his own sake, with Mr. Earle's chatty and discursive way of writing. But we are not quite clear that the book would be a safe one to put into the hands of one who knew absolutely

nothing of the history of the English tongue. From our point of view the objection which we made at the threshold colours everything. We never feel quite sure how far Mr. Earle means to write a history of the English tongue from the very beginning, and how far he is merely writing a treatise on the received usages of the English tongue for the last three or four centuries. Either of these objects would be intelligible and useful; neither has ever been thoroughly done by any competent scholar; no one is, as far as sound knowledge of the subject is concerned, better qualified than Mr. Earle to undertake either. But in the present book he seems to us not to have thoroughly grasped the difference between the two. When Mr. Earle distinguishes "Saxon" and "English" we never feel quite certain whether he means "Saxon" to be part of his immediate subject or not. We suspect that he was not always quite certain himself. In the very passage about the *fox* and the *vixen* of which we have just been speaking, Mr. Earle first tells us "the ancient and native form of the noun feminine was in *en*," and then goes on to show how it has been supplanted in modern English use by the French ending in *ess*. Directly after he speaks of "Saxon examples," "this Saxon feminine," &c. The one form of speech is that which comes naturally to a man who thoroughly understands and feels the history of his native language; the other is the way of speaking of a man who has half confounded himself, and who is sure to confound others, by the use of an inaccurate nomenclature. This cleaving to an exploded way of talking is the more strange in Mr. Earle because he takes some pains to show that the literary Old-English is not Saxon at all. Starting from the ignorance which Alfred attributes to his own Saxons at the time of his accession, and from the literary fame of the Northumbrian Angles at an earlier time, Mr. Earle argues that the whole of the "ancient and native" literature of England is in fact Anglian. It is therefore perfectly amazing that he should take such pains to call it by the name which he tries to show does not belong to it. This stumbling-block meets us throughout the book, and we also have our doubts as to a great deal of the new terminology which Mr. Earle often proposes. We had some little trouble in grasping his exact meaning when he talks of Presentive and Subpresentive and Symbolic words, about Flat or Collocative Syntax, and the like. With all his fondness for familiar illustration, Mr. Earle seems to us to have made his book in many points far too hard and abstract, to have often clothed it with a form which is likely to drive back the beginner at the threshold of his studies.

The merits of the book, and they are great and many, lie in the details. We cannot turn a page without being struck with the surprising range of Mr. Earle's reading, which is not confined to this or that age or subject, but seems fairly to take in all stages of the language and all classes of literature, both grave and gay. And we admire not only the wide range of Mr. Earle's reading, but the happy ingenuity with which he contrives to find something to his purpose, even in what might have seemed the most unpromising corners. What Mr. Earle has to tell us about the history and usages of particular words and idioms is in almost every case happy. His remarks in such cases are always ingenious; commonly, to our thinking, sound. He constantly shows that surest sign of a thinker who has gone to the bottom of his subject, that of saying things which, as soon as we hear them, make us wonder that we had never thought of them ourselves. On one or two points we have our differences with Mr. Earle, some of which we should like to argue out at full length. We should especially enjoy a stand-up fight with him about infinitives and participles and participial nouns, and all that is involved in that most idiomatic piece of English, the question "What are you a-doing of?" We think too that Mr. Earle has, in point of amount, exaggerated the degree of influence which French has had upon English. But he has done thoroughly good service in tracing out French influence in several forms and in several quarters where we should hardly have thought of looking for it. One of the parts of the book which are best worth studying is the last chapter, that on Prosody. All that Mr. Earle has to say about alliteration, rhyme—he has not brought himself to follow Mr. Skeat's praiseworthy daring in spelling it *rime*—and rhythm, shows signs of real and careful thought. We will end with a passage which shows how pre-eminently qualified Mr. Earle is to write the history of the English language, if he could once take in the fact that forms of nomenclature which he himself can use harmlessly may lead the unlearned and unstable into endless and hopeless confusion:—

A period comes in the course of the higher development of language, when the sonorousness of words gives place to the sentiment of modulation, whereby a musical unity is given to the sentence like the unity of thought. It is to this that the foremost languages of the world, and the English language for one, have now attained. If we look at Saxon literature, we see two widely different eras of language living on side by side, the elder one in the poetry, and the later one in the prose. The alliterative poetry belongs to an age in which the word-sound was the prominent feature; the prose is already far gone into that stage in which the sound of the word has fallen back and become secondary to the rhythm of the sentence. The development of rhythm had already become so full and ample by the time of the Conquest, that the restraint of iambic metre was needless, and it was readily accepted at the hands of our French instructors. Rhyme also was adopted; not indeed for the first time, for occasional examples occur before; but the general use of rhyme came in with the iambic metre under French influence. Rhyme is an attendant upon metre, but it acts in concert with rhythm necessarily; and for the most part it corresponds to the divisions of syntax, though this is unessential. Rhyme is a very insignificant thing philologically, as compared with alliteration; for whereas this is, as we have before shown, an accentual reverberation, and rests upon the most vital part of

[December 9, 1871.]

words; rhyme is but a syllabic resonance, and rests most frequently upon those syllables which are vocally of the lowest consideration. It is, however, one among the many little tributaries towards the evidence of a fondness in man for a sonorous accompaniment to his language.

THE LATE DUKE OF BROGLIE ON FRENCH CONSTITUTIONS.*

TEN years ago a few copies of the late Duke of Broglie's *Vues sur le gouvernement de la France* were seized by the police at the printer's. The proceedings at first instituted against the author were promptly abandoned; and as the book had not been written for publication, nothing more was heard of it until it was published in May 1870 by the author's son, the present Duke of Broglie. The fall of the Empire, and the provisional character of the present Government, have given the work a still greater interest than it possessed last year. It deals with all the questions which are now waiting for settlement—with the form of government, with the nature and limits of local organization, with the methods of securing the freedom of the press, freedom of worship, freedom of association. All these subjects are discussed with fulness and precision in the body of the work, while in the introduction the Duke undertakes to demonstrate that the attempt to set up Republican institutions in France must necessarily be a failure. He arrives at this conclusion by more than one road. First of all, he passes some just criticisms on the various constitutional experiments of which France has been the theatre since 1789. Judged, he says, by the sole legitimate test—the state in which they severally found and left the country—constitutional Monarchy has a paramount claim on the affections of Frenchmen. It gave them thirty-four years of uninterrupted peace; it gave them political liberty founded on respect for mutual rights; it accepted and consolidated the main results of the Revolution; it showed that Kings might reign without primogeniture, without personal privileges, without feudalism. The difficulty which the Duke does not satisfactorily dispose of is how a Monarchy in every way so admirable should have been so easily destroyed. He has his answer indeed to this problem in the theory that the Revolution of 1848 was "an effect without a cause." Yet if it be granted that the men who overthrew the Orleans dynasty wanted only electoral reform, which they had already all but gained, and a King who reigned a little more and governed a little less, which the course of nature would shortly have given them, what made them thus recklessly impatient? No doubt the difficulty of founding a permanent Republic in France is very serious. But is it any easier to found a constitutional monarchy in a country which has broken with its past, and uprooted all the institutions out of which monarchy naturally grows? Perhaps the Duke himself was more impressed with the magnitude of the undertaking than he could bring himself to admit; for his final conclusion is that the only alternatives between which the friends of liberty have to choose are "a Republic which borders on Monarchy, and a Monarchy which borders on a Republic." His ideal Republic includes the division of the Legislature into two Chambers, the unity and responsibility of the Executive, and its participation in the work of legislation by means of an initiative and a veto. His ideal Monarchy abandons all thought of a restoration of institutions. In no other way can it possibly adapt itself to the existing condition of France. In point of fact, it will only differ from a Republic in the constitution and permanence of the Executive. Is it worth while for the sake of preserving monarchical forms in which so little of the monarchical spirit will survive to excite the opposition—foolish and impracticable it may be, but not the less enthusiastic and persistent—of the Republican party? The vice of such a policy is that it wastes on the preservation of a mere name those conservative forces which, if they acted through Republican forms, might introduce a natural and healthy counterpoise to Republican passion. The Duke of Broglie has, however, another argument to urge in the supposed natural unfitness of a Republic to discharge the onerous duties which devolve upon every French Government. To preserve without diminution the unity and the influence of France; to maintain Paris, the natural source and centre of that influence, in the position as regards the provinces which it has so long held; to open an unbounded field to individual energy and ambition, while preserving order on the one hand and liberty on the other; and to achieve all this under a system which subjects every holder of power to the crucible of periodical election, is, as he justly says, an undertaking of unparalleled magnitude. It is in the nature of a Republican Government to pursue equality at any cost. But in every great nation there grows up, independently of legislation, a kind of natural hierarchy, founded on tradition and on those inevitable social inequalities which are produced by the ordinary course of events. A constitutional Monarchy places itself at the head of this hierarchy; a Republican Government strives continually to destroy it; and in order to do this, it is forced from time to time to appeal to the passions of the less fortunate members of the community. A Republic is the perpetual adversary of secure and hereditary positions, and for this reason it is necessarily drawn to confide power to adventurers—men who have none of those antecedents which tend to raise their possessions above the ordinary level. Consequently the ends pursued by the Govern-

ment will not only be mischievous in their own nature; they will be pursued by men who will introduce disorder and corruption into every department of the State. Even in Switzerland there is a perpetual revolt going on against the superiority of the middle class over the artisans; even in the United States—the country of the Washingtons, the Franklins, the Adamses, and the Madisons—"the democratic spirit exercises an inexorable ostracism against the political inheritors of these great citizens."

This last illustration would have been more telling if the Duke had said who are the political inheritors of the great citizens in question. It is true no doubt that statesmanship in the United States is at a low level as compared with what it was at the foundation of the Republic, but the cause does not appear to be any "inexorable ostracism" on the part of the democracy. If it were, there would at least be no difficulty in pointing out the exiles. We should be able to say, This man has found no constituency to return him to Congress since he opposed such or such a democratic measure; that man has shown too much independence of character ever to be in office again. So far as we know, there are no instances of this kind where the politicians who have set themselves against the popular current have been able as well as honest. Even if the Washingtons and the Franklins, the Adamses and the Madisons, are now without political heirs, they have not always been so. Webster and Calhoun have hardly been long enough dead to make it safe to say that the death of American statesmanship is the result of Republican institutions, and not merely of accident. The Duke of Broglie rightly recognises the determination to pursue equality at any cost as one of the chief dangers to which Governments are now incident. But he does not show that Republican Governments are specially incident to it. The natural hierarchy which he describes as growing up in every great nation is the real defence against such a determination; and its success in holding its own will be in proportion to the wisdom, energy, and liberality with which it discharges its function. Of course, if constitutional monarchy were an institution dear to a nation, this hierarchy would gain by having a King at the head of the resisting force. But if monarchy is in discredit with a nation, where is the benefit of having the resisting force associated with an unpopular title? A section in a Dissenting community which wished to increase the power of its ministers might as well think to disarm opposition by calling these ministers bishops. A constitutional sovereign has no choice but to confide power to those whom the Legislature designates as his Ministers; and if the party which is the perpetual adversary of secure and hereditary position has the command of the Legislature—a contingency which may happen equally under a Monarchy or a Republic—he may be as necessarily drawn to confide power to men whose antecedents do not raise their possessions above the ordinary level as though he were an elected President instead of an hereditary King.

It is not to be denied of course that the constitution of an Executive renewable at stated periods by popular election is a problem of very great difficulty. To cover, says the Duke, with the mantle of inviolability five or three men, or one man, taken yesterday from the crowd, and destined to return to it to-morrow, and to prosecute their pretended counsellors in their stead, cannot be seriously attempted; while to prosecute them in their own persons, to send the Supreme Power to prison, with two gendarmes by way of escort, would in effect be a revolution. Is it certain, however, that political ingenuity has exhausted its resources in devising these two alternatives? More and more the tendency of free societies is to entrust the supreme power in fact, though not in name, to the leader of the party which commands a majority in the popular branch of the Legislature. It is so in England, it is so in France, it is so in Belgium, it is so to a great extent in Austria. Why should it be impossible to make the name and the reality coincide, and to provide that the chief magistrate of a Republic shall be elected by the Legislature, and hold office until he either resigns or is displaced by a vote of the same Assembly which appointed him? Undoubtedly where monarchy exists there are immense advantages in the elevation of the sovereign above the dust and turmoil of political strife. But it is another question whether, where a Republic exists, anything is gained by making the chief authority as much like a King as possible. Sir Charles Dilke has not convinced us that it would be better for England to be governed by a President than by a Queen; but supposing he had pulled down the Monarchy, we are by no means sure that it would not be better to have Mr. Gladstone as President and First Minister in one, than to have Mr. Gladstone as First Minister and Lord Granville as President. The former expedient would at all events have the advantage of giving the President no field for ambition outside the Legislature.

The crisis foretold by the Duke of Broglie in this book has now arrived. The Empire has fallen before its first storm—it's first serious embarrassment—and Frenchmen have now to choose between attempting anew to found "a reasonable Republic in conformity with the principles of public law, the lessons of experience, and the maxims of the sages of the New World, or submitting once more to a military dictatorship, tempered by some bastard institutions in which the essential conditions of political liberty, maintained for decency's sake in form, are sacrificed in reality to the supreme interest of order, or returning to that constitutional Monarchy which was sketched out in 1814, and perfected in 1830." Against this statement of the problem there is nothing to be said. The conditions under which freedom and order can coexist in France are substantially the same whether the first solution or

* *Vues sur le gouvernement de la France.* Ouvrage inédit du Duc de Broglie, publié par son fils. Paris: 1870.

the third be the one adopted. But unfortunately it is so common to think names of more importance than things that the supporters of this union may easily find themselves arrayed against one another, because the real identity of the objects they have in view is concealed by the superficial distinction which classes some of them among Republicans and others among Monarchists. Every real friend of constitutional government will desire that so disastrous a mistake may be averted.

LAKEVILLE.*

FROM time to time we stumble upon a novel which, as we feel at once, has the charm of a certain freshness, and such a novel is *Lakeville*. It is not merely that the author breaks what is comparatively virgin ground—that she lays her scene in America, and, as we presume, writes with the knowledge of a native. But in the delineation of feminine character she has a knack amounting to a gift, while her manner of telling her story stands the crucial test of carrying our interest along with her. Whether Mrs. or Miss Healy's name is better known on the other side of the Atlantic than in England, we do not pretend to say. The balance of internal evidence inclines us to believe *Lakeville* to be the author's first novel, although there are points about it that may tell the other way. There is a certain want of proportion in the parts which a little experience would have corrected. The story drags in the middle, and then, when it has made a fresh start, is a second time suffered to languish. The promise of the early chapters is not altogether redeemed by the rest of the performance; the writer prematurely lavishes power and material which she had better have husbanded, and falls into the too common fault of spoiling a good two-volume novel by spinning it out to regulation length. But there can be no question about the lifelike merit of her studies of young ladies; whether in the convent school, in the vulgar fashion of a mushroom Western city, or in the quiet family circle of a château in the French provinces, with them she is always at home. A man blundering about among them would leave you the confused impression of a blurred mass of lilies, roses, muslin, simpers, hoydenish spirits, and mawkish sentimentality. Mrs. Healy interests and pleases us, because she distinguishes. She indicates embryo differences of character, and touches off the budding instincts that may blossom and bear fruits of good or evil, with the light, yet unfaltering, touch of a connoisseur. Awkward her school-girls may be with their ungainly contours, moral and physical, and yet in their attitudes you see the promise of future grace. Later, when they are launched on the frothy seas of American society, they may scandalize our English ideas by the more than frank freedom of their ways and words; yet we cannot help conceiving them to be perfectly true to nature. Then the author understands the use of light and shade. Her heroines move in the gay world, and play into her hands as a romancist by the sparkle of their attractions, meretricious or other. Yet their beauty, youth, and flippancy come out into relief against a sober background of more solid merits. Throughout, indeed, the main and the subsidiary morals of her story are good; vice continually stands reproved, while folly cowers before virtuous wisdom, and heartlessness, selfishness, and worldly seeking bring their inevitable penalties. The author indeed—we do not know whether it is from an excess of womanly tenderness or by a trick of the novelist's art—is rather in the habit of unexpectedly parading redeeming qualities in natures that have pretty nearly succeeded in utterly alienating our sympathies. We certainly do not mean to say that thoroughly diabolical or depraved characters are matters of everyday occurrence; and we should be sorry to recur to the melodramatic slovenliness of novelists of the old school, who, when they had once stamped an unfortunate with "a sinister curl of the lip," sent him through their three volumes with a seared conscience and the brand of Cain upon his brow. But to be constrained continually to relent in our most deliberate judgments by some unlooked-for sign of grace on the part of a most hardened sinner, ends at least by generating a fatal distrust of the author. As for the men of the book, with these, like most ladies, she breaks down, although they may pass muster well enough with those lady readers whom she is most likely to attract. It is not merely that in a thousand little touches, meant to be telling, she betrays her ignorance or shows weakness; that the dialogues of their unguarded moments are only the bread and butter chat of a girl's afternoon tea-party, freely translated from feminine to masculine. Even the hero whom she means us to admire, if not to worship, is a genuine woman's man, or rather a man-woman. The spoiled child of his mother, he lays himself out to be spoiled by his mistress too, just as a cat curls herself on the rug to be petted, while spitting all the time on the slightest provocation, and perfectly ready to make free half playfully with her claws. The man has no passion in him, although its absence may be compensated by a good deal of native propriety. For three long mortal years he carefully corks up his feelings, although sunning himself all the time in the warm smiles of the beloved one, who loves him demonstratively as a sister. When the proposal does come, as he very frankly observes himself in announcing the long-expected engagement to his mother, it comes from the lady rather than from him. That is the fault of all the men; one and all, saints and sinners, are artificial puppets,

responding in unnatural jerks to the strings you see passing from the hands of their creator.

The heroine is admirable, on the other hand. There is nothing whatever of the puppet about Valerie Turner. She is all flesh and blood, and fire and passion "at that," to borrow an Americanism to which the author is exceedingly partial. Or, if she be a puppet, she is the plaything of her own warm impulsive nature, when she is turned out into the world with neither friends nor experience for her guides. French by her mother's side, Roman Catholic by religion, she has been reared and educated in a convent, whence she is fetched away to "come out" at Lakeville. At Lakeville she is domesticated in the family of Mr. West, her guardian, a man of excellent heart if he could only spare the time to listen to its promptings amid the bustle and whirl of his business. He does nothing for his own children further than giving them pretty nearly *carte blanche* for their expenses, so he cannot be expected to look closely after his ward. Valerie, or Val, as she is called, is kept straight by her warm feelings and native honesty of disposition. She falls desperately in love, and misplaces her affection; but she withdraws her love by a violent effort of will the moment she has ceased to respect her lover. As for ourselves, we confess we felt early in the story that we must have flirted with her had we ever met her in the flesh, and we think it very likely that flirtation would have ripened into a love which she would have refused. For Miss Turner, impulsive as she was, was fastidious, and would have bestowed herself on no man who did not come up to her heroic ideal. Nothing more natural than that a girl of her nature should promise herself to the rascal who nearly made shipwreck of her life; but then she credited Mr. Elliot with all the qualities that should have gone with his grand air and godlike person. Nothing more plausible than that the discovery of his worthlessness should have wellnigh made shipwreck of her life, because he rudely dissipated her world of fond illusions, and shadowed with the blackness of profound unbelief the gorgeous tints with which her fancy had coloured it. Her ideal of all perfection once proved false, who could persuade her incredulity that her heart could assure itself of holding-ground anywhere? Luckily for her, outside the frivolous circles in which her lot has been cast, there is an elderly lady who attracts her by the sympathy of a nature frank as her own, and who has already shown a certain interest in her. This elderly lady is mother of the eminently respectable and loveable youth whose character we have attempted to summarize. Val Turner tends him platonic affection, under the chaperonship of his approving parent, who foresees the end of it as clearly as we do; but all the time Val remains perfectly natural. It is not her fault if, with the author, she is deceived a second time and does not see that this Alick Graham is a muff. We suspect that muffs not unfrequently make the best husbands, going down to the grave undetected by their admiring wives, and we are glad to believe the author and congratulate Val upon her happy prospects.

Welcoming anything like the originality in which our novels in general are so sorely deficient, we can recommend the pictures of American life. Mrs. Healy naturally extends more sympathy than an English writer might to a state of society essentially commercial and in a state of transition. She accepts without remark, or dismisses with leniency, much that we have been taught to regard as vulgar. But she is very evidently a lady herself, and knows a lady when she sees one. With all Val's impulsive candour of speech and action, with her many *brusqueries* amounting to *bêtises*, with slight allowance for her Transatlantic habits and fashion of thought, she might pass muster and attract admiration in the most fastidious circles. So indeed might her old friend Mrs. Graham, although we suspect Mrs. Graham would find the ponderous son she is so proud of shut many doors against her. Therefore, when we see the rest of the Lakeville society represented as almost without exception vulgar in one way or another, we fancy we do those prosperous Western towns no injustice if we assume that persons whose refinement would satisfy our prejudices are about as rare there as the righteous men in the doomed cities of the plain. It can scarcely be otherwise indeed; for towns that have shot up in a generation round the sites of stockades and frontier block-houses are not the residences of those older families who can spare themselves time for mental culture. The dollar is the object of general worship, and it is wealth that regulates social rank. The grandfather of Belle Sherwood, the wealthy belle of the place, had been a bricklayer; and her father sagely suppresses himself, while the young lady does the honours of his mansion with lavish purse. Hiram Dross, the great *parti* of the city, and the ambition of all its most fashionable maidens, made himself, and has no other claim to their consideration than his money. Mr. West, Val's guardian, a worthy man, as we said, always bustles about, his watch in his hand, and has little but dollars on his lips. Indeed the sole pleasure of the leading men is the mad chase of the money they never stop to spend; their only pride is the tasteless display that advertises their means. No wonder their wives and daughters take their tone from them, and think as vulgarly as they act. *Lakeville* throws some curious lights upon American manners. The liberty of action accorded to unmarried ladies will startle English prejudices. We learn that ordinary gallantry not only permits, but enjoins, young men in society to escort unchaperoned to the play the young woman they aspire "to keep company with." They pay for the ladies' tickets and places and refreshments, and a very disagreeable drain it must be upon salaried clerks of moderate means. Summer evening dances in the neighbouring country are a favourite form of gaiety.

* *Lakeville; or, Substance and Shadow.* By Mary Healy. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Marston. 1871.

and you invite a young lady to drive out with you *tête-à-tête* in the vehicle you hire for the occasion, and bring her back at all hours of the night or morning. The very existence of such a practice says much, from one point of view, for the real morality of those rising cities, and perhaps it may be a feature of their social policy to stimulate youthful energy by promoting imprudent marriages. Nor, indeed, need the marriage be so very imprudent after all. In the first place, the Benedict would begin by economizing the cost of the offerings for which society taxes him; in the next, being shelved as far as flirting went, he would be driven back perforce on the alternative pursuit of the American gentleman, and compelled to concentrate his time and his energy on his business.

Thus, so long as the scenes pass at Lakeville, we read the book with an interest independent of the plot, which, however, is advancing creditably all the time. But we could well dispense with being compelled to dawdle over Europe in the train of the heroine while she is undergoing the tedious process of her heart-cure. Even her lover, Alice Graham, left her more than once, actually making a journey to America on a dimly-voiced pretext which she naturally resented, and for our part we do not blame him in the least. The chapters devoted to the visits to her relatives at their Normandy château are good, as we said before. There is nothing original in the idea of a hypocritical French girl, all demureness before her parents and her future husband, but who has tasted in secret of the fruit of the knowledge of good and evil, and indulged herself slyly in a license which the author only indicates. Yet Reine d'Antoile is very well put on the stage, and because our author is much more original than most, we are not unjust enough to expect her to be original everywhere. But we have been at Paris before, and at Rome, and Florence, and Venice, and we confess we do not care to be dragged thither on a humdrum tour, merely to listen to the admiring exclamations of untravelled ladies. Through that part of the story, however, the reader may take a hint from Mr. Graham and give himself leave of absence. We think we may assure him he will not regret having visited Lakeville and made Miss Turner's acquaintance.

SEELEY'S LIVY.* (Second Notice.)

A STUDY of Livy's First Book with Mr. Seeley's annotations will convince all who have had any doubts on the subject that, although the materials whence the historian had to draw were scanty, his research and industry were by no means equal to his powers of description and his talent for catching that side of a national legend or tradition which was most likely to attract the sympathies and tickle the pride of later Romans. Livy handles the early history, which it was his task to endeavour to evolve, in a manner which would have been justifiable in the poet who was composing the Eighth Book of the *Aeneid* about the same period, or in that lighter bard who, in his *Fausti*, embraces much the same fables, with the difference that they are fined down into graceful elegiacs. Indeed there are passages in the first decade tending to show that he did not profess to be able to achieve much more than this; and, such being the case, it less shocks our sense of historical proprieties to be, as it were, taken behind the scenes, and introduced to the shifts which the historian makes in escaping frequent dilemmas, when we bear in mind that his data were meagre, his aim rather a chronicle than a history, and his conviction consistent, that about much that he recorded the truth was "almost indiscernible from distance":—

My own study of Livy [writes Mr. Seeley, in depreciation of Dr. Dyer's excessive praise of Livy's historical diligence and research] has led me to adopt the commoner opinion that he is a very agreeable, but a very careless writer, that he has very little faith in what he himself records of the primitive period, and that his chief care is to produce a fluent narrative in which the inconsistencies, though not removed, shall be smuggled out of sight.—P. 53.

In this view, just in the main, there may be a trifle of severity; yet we think that few persons will attempt to combat the general cogency of the notes, wherein, as occasion serves, Professor Seeley substantiates it. On the astonishingly strong phrase "satis constat," which Livy applies at the very threshold to legends about Aeneas as purely fabulous as the connexion of the fabled "Brute" with our own country in its earliest days, he notes passages which endorse prodigies with the same expression, whilst at the same time proving by others that Livy was sceptical on these points. Matters which he was resolved "nec affirmare nec refellere" seem to have appeared to him entitled to be spoken of in the language of belief. At the same time Livy cannot be amenable to the charge of blind credulity when he uses, in c. iii., the language of doubt as to the identity of the Ascanius who succeeded Aeneas at Lavinium with Creusa's son, whom the Julian family honoured as Iulus; and, in c. iv., lets drop a strong hint of scepticism as to the alleged fatherhood of Mars to the twin offspring of Rhea Silvia. As Mr. Seeley shows, a desire on Livy's part to steer clear of improbabilities and to nationalize the fables which he came across sometimes betrays him into clumsiness, as where, in c. vii., he represents Cacus, who in Virgil is a monster living in a cave, as a shepherd, to avoid supernaturalism; and so introduces "the cave," which in Virgil was the monster's "ingens

"regia," unexplained and *apropos* of nothing. Nor is this carelessness all; here and there, as our annotator clearly proves, the historian unwittingly slurs over difficulties, which he shrinks from meeting boldly because he is in a strait between two accounts, and can be happy with either, as the occasion suits. Thus, in c. ix., an instance of his concealment of discrepancies occurs in the feast to Consus, or the equestrian Neptune, whose altar was in the Circus Maximus, and whose festival was attended with Circensian games. Virgil and Cicero make the Rape of the Sabines take place in the Circus; but Livy—who, by the way, omits to mention, or presumes his reader to infer, that "Consus" is the equestrian Neptune—says nothing about the "Circus," because in the thirty-fifth chapter he is going to attribute the erection of that to Tarquinus Priscus, who, we are told, first brought racers and boxers from Etruria. Ovid, Mr. Seeley reminds us, felt the discrepancy between the two stories, and got over it by the hypothesis of a temporary theatre on the site of the future Circus. In c. x. our attention is drawn to a similar suppression, where it is said that Romulus "spolia—gerens in Capitolium ascendit," and where the point of the story is slurred over—i.e., the monarch's institution of the Triumph. This Dionysius distinctly connects with this victory; but Livy appears to have had a pre-arranged that he must attribute both the Capitoline Temple and the triumphal dress to Tarquinus Priscus, of whom, in 38, he says that he "triumphans redit"; and hence his reticence in c. x. In like manner, in the next chapter, he does not tell us, *apropos* of Spurius Tarpeius, the governor of the citadel, that "Tarpeius" was the old name of the Capitoline. That would have spoilt or disparaged his story. He does tell this in c. lv. About the Curtian Lake, too, there is a discrepancy in the stories at i. 13 and vii. 6, and yet Livy, as our editor notes, relates both stories as historic facts. In the latter passage he seems to admit that there are no data for a decision between the competing legends, and that he adopts the last as the more recent and popular. In all likelihood both were equally suggested by a desire to account for a local name which lacked a *raison d'être*. We could multiply like cases where Mr. Seeley's criticism in his foot-notes will be eminently serviceable in pointing out the slips and slurrings of an historian who manifestly took a somewhat poetic and lax view of his functions and duties. In one place (c. xxvii. compared with xxx.) Livy is shown to have forgotten the sequel of his story of the war with Fidene and Veii. In another he is convicted of a mild anachronism, where, in c. xxxiv., he anticipates history in calling Ancus "nobilis una imagine Numae," whereas these busts were of a later date than the Regal period. But occasionally it strikes us that Mr. Seeley is over precise in subjecting Livy to a very stringent rule—e.g., when in c. xl. 2, he hits a blot in his representation of the sons of Ancus as jealous of Servius, and as grumbling that the sovereignty had fallen among slaves—namely, the obliviousness on Livy's part "that he had just denied that Servius was a slave." Here, it seems to us, Livy's consistency is not assailable. Howsoever the facts may have been, he nowhere says that there was not such a rumour afloat, and this it would be the interest of the sons of Ancus to encourage and circulate.

But if the task of noting Livy's inconsistencies gives rise to many valuable historical annotations, so does that of correcting Dr. Dyer's misconceptions of Livy's meaning conduce to exact and precise interpretation of Livy's text. None will regret that this critic's name has been a sort of red rag to Professor Seeley, if it obviates the risks of mistranslation in cases where really the possibility of going wrong arises out of the authority of the misleader. It seems scarcely credible that, even without the help of a note on the omission of the adverb, a translator's insight should have failed to discover that in the words touching Romulus and Remus in their adolescence, "nec in stabulis nec ad pecora segnes, venando peragrare saltus" (c. iv.), nothing else is implied but that, "though not neglecting their ordinary occupations, they were especially devoted to hunting." Yet Dr. Dyer, at p. 43 of his *Kings of Rome*, misrepresents the sense in this wise—"As they grew up, the boys took to hunting instead of slothfully tending cattle." In the answer of the Sabines to the petition of Romulus's envoys for the privilege of intermarriage occurs the obvious taunt, "equod femini quoque asylum aperuissent; id enim denuo compar connubium fore" (c. ix.). In place of Dr. Dyer's colourless paraphrase,—"In that manner they would obtain suitable wives"—Mr. Seeley so renders the italicized words as to bring out the force of *denuo*: "for nothing short of that would be a marriage of like with like." It is of no small consequence to sound views respecting biography and history that even individual substantives and adjectives should be translated accurately. But Dr. Dyer, from a vague notion of the meaning of *ferox*, which is simply "spirited" or "confident," is led to talk of the *fervency* of Tullius (cf. c. xxiii. and xxvi.). In c. xxv. he fails to see that when the survivor of the three Curatiæ is said "male sustinere arma," it is his "shield" that he can with difficulty bear; in c. lvi., he renders "primoribus" officers, whereas it should be men of high rank; and in the next chapter he misses the supreme indignity of Tarquin's threat to Lucretia—"cum mortuā jugulatum serum nudum positurum." *Servum*, explains Mr. Seeley, means the slave, Tarquin's own slave and sole attendant, the "comes unus" of the beginning of the chapter. But the greatest mistake of all is, where, in c. lix., Dr. Dyer takes the words "præsens rerum indignitas," which are used to denote the motive for bitter language on the part of Brutus against the Tarquins, for Livy's reason for suppressing language likely to be unpalatable to the

* *Livy*. With Introduction, Historical Examination, and Notes, Book 1. By J. R. Seeley, M.A., Professor of Modern History, Cambridge. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1871.

government of Augustus at the time of his writing. "Livy," he says, "suppresses some parts of Brutus's invective against Tarquinus Superbus, observing that the present posture of affairs (under the Empire) rendered it difficult for writers to insert them." The word "credo," as Professor Seeley reminds us, indicates that Livy in this passage is not writing from a report, but thinking what Brutus would be likely to say.

Not indeed that Professor Seeley needs a butt to aim at, in order better to elucidate and interpret points of doubt and interest. In connexion with the closing chapters of the First Book the name of "Brutus" is familiar enough. But when (in c. lvi.) this immemorial hero, this liberator whom Livy describes in much the same terms as Ovid, who calls him "stulti sapiens imitator," *Bruti quoque haud abuit cognomen, "acquiesces"*—that is, "in the nickname of Brutus"—it is good service in a sound scholar to settle what that term really meant—i.e., "a lump," or "a dullard." Because Festus gives "gravis" as a synonym of "Brutus," Muller imagines that the whole story of the stupidity of this hater of kings falls to the ground, and it does not seem a sufficient answer of Sir G. Lewis that "gravis" may mean "sluggish." The expression in c. lix., where the bystanders are represented as wondering "*unde novum in Bruti pectori ingenium*," is, Mr. Seeley notes, one which would sound very forcible to a Roman; and it is, moreover, conclusive as to the sense in which an ancient Roman would take it. Lucretius and Valerius marvelled, it is plain, whence such unwonted spirit and wits "in the breast of a dullard."

For readers who either take Livy in hand for the first time, or recur to it after having laid it by in the years when history was more thought of than scholarship, an access of precision and clearness of sense will be imparted by the comparisons and derivations of particular words with which this commentary abounds. Thus it is interesting to be led to realize the difference between the Greek and the Roman kinds of "oracle" in a note on "responsa sortitum" (c. lvi.), which shows that though the old Italian practice of soothsaying by wooden inscribed lots had by Cicero's time died out everywhere but at Praeneste, yet, in default of another word for "oracle," Livy, as well as Virgil and Horace, used the word "sortes" for describing even the Greek oracle, where, it is needless to say, the response was given in quite a different way. Other distinctions—e.g., between "concio," "a meeting where there was only speaking," and "comitia," "meetings where there was voting" (xvii.); between "juvenes," "men of military age" (the idea of youth being eliminated), and "senes," "men excused from service," a distinction which is shown to be observed by Virgil and Tacitus, as well as Livy (see note at c. xxxi.); between "urbem" and "republicam" (xxviii.), and "nosse" and "scire" (liv.) conduce sensibly to the attainment of accuracy, and enhance the critical and philological interest of a student in Livy's pages. Equally satisfactory it is to find the etymology of "lustrum" cleared up and illustrated in c. xliv., and the derivation of "Esquiliae," or rather as it was originally "Exquiliæ," ascertained, by comparison of the word "inquilini," to betoken those who lived outside, and not inside, the then existing limits of the city. Both these derivations are borrowed, with due acknowledgment, from the German, but others betoken original acuteness as much as these do research and observation.

Of the purely critical notes, a good sample is that one wherein (at c. iv. 22) Mr. Seeley explodes the needless conjecture of "forte quadam *an* divinitus," for "forte quadam divinitus"; a conjecture which had two commentators to support it on the ground that chance and Providence are opposed, and which even Madvig adopts, though on the different ground that Livy could not positively assert that the occurrence was providential. Mr. Seeley justly deems the received text to be a translation of *θεια τοι τύχη*, and to represent the opposite of "forte temere," "by mere haphazard." As to Madvig's objection, he meets it with Livy's previous assertion "debetatur, ut opinor, fatis"; and as against the earlier one, he quotes Tennyson's line, "These jewels whereupon I chanced divinely," to which we might add a citation from a higher authority, "The lot is cast into the lap, but the whole disposing thereof is the Lord's." The word "divinitus" reminds us that in c. xxxvi. the use of "divinus," in the sense of soothsayer, as applied by Tarquin to Attus Navius, is well traced, and illustrated from ancient and modern parallels, and there are few expressions or passages of difficulty to be met in the First Book which are not satisfactorily and happily cleared up. Of these few the most puzzling is that which concerns the ambuscade chosen by Romulus in his war with the Fidenates (c. xiv.), where the words of the MSS., "circa densa obsita virgulta," are involved in obscurity. Even Madvig's solution is questionable, for "circa virgulta" can only by straining be taken for "here and there about the brushwood," and, as he admits, "obsita virgulta" is a less correct expression than "locus obsitus virgultus." The passage runs thus:—"Egressus omnibus copiis partem militum locis circa densa obsita virgulta obscuris subsidere in insidiis jussit"; and the only attempt at a clearance of it which occurs to us is to take the words "circa densa obsita virgulta" as a parenthetical clause, exegetic of the epithet "obscuri," which we admit would be more in its place before than after the parenthesis. The interpretation would thus be that Romulus bade a part of his army lie in ambush in a dark and obscure spot, the existence of which was due to the fact that "thick brushwood or shrubs had been planted around." But this is only another guess; and it is no marvel that, where all is guess work, Mr. Seeley does not care to adventure amongst so many guessers. In other passages where the text is of more importance to the elucidation of what little

history there is of the Regal period, he does hazard conjectures, and these not only plausible, but probable. Of such is his acute suggestion in a note on c. xxiv. 7, that the title of "Pater patratus," which occurs in the formulas of making treaties, and redressing violations of treaty, must have some connexion with the doctrine of "patria potestas"; because to give up to a foreign State citizens who had violated its rights (a special function of the Fetials) implies this authority, resident in such a functionary, and capable of being exercised over such. And equally valuable is his explanation of the step which Tarquinus Superbus took when he "misicut maniplos," or "made one Romano-Latin maniple instead of a Roman troop and a Latin troop, and at the same time two where there had been one—i.e., for a simple maniple a double one consisting of two centuries." For the full comprehension of the problem readers must refer to the passage and note in question. It is observable, however, that such notes bring scholarship to bear on history, as does the convincing criticism of Professor Seeley on the passage c. xvii. 6, "Pates ita gratiam inuenit summā potestate populo permittā; . . . de-creverunt enim ut cum populus regem jussisset id ita ratum esset, si patres auctores fierent." He shows from a consideration of its meaning how utterly untenable was Niebuhr's distinction between *plebs* and *populus*, and not less clearly how incorrect is Mommsen's theory that "populus" meant the army. "Populus," he notes, "is nearly πόλις." Its English equivalent is not "people"—i.e., "nation"; but "State" or "body politic." "Populus Romanus" is the "Roman Republic."

We are convinced that if Mr. Seeley's continuation of his editorial task upon Livy is as thorough as its commencement, he will not only succeed in making the ground of early Roman history safer and surer footing, but also will enhance appreciably the already sensible pleasure of studying one of the most brilliant and pictorial of ancient historians.

CUMMING'S CITIES OF THE NATIONS.*

DR. CUMMING'S present volume may be considered as a sequel to the *Seventh Vial*, noticed in our columns about a year ago. Indeed, as we are informed in the preface that "under the Seventh Vial the cities of the nations fell," it is difficult to see why their fall should not have been treated in the former work. And yet, on second thoughts, it is possible to understand why a separate volume has been devoted to this interesting subject. More than a year has elapsed since the publication of the *Seventh Vial*, and therefore more than a year's supply of fresh material for apocalyptic lucubrations has appeared in the correspondence and articles of the daily press. For cuttings from the *Times*, *Daily News*, and *Pall Mall Gazette* occupy about as prominent a place in this as in the learned Doctor's last volume. In fact, we may say that the original portion of it—by which we must be clearly understood not to mean more than that portion of it which is written by the author—is chiefly comprised in the last four chapters, or rather discourses, for they are apparently a reprint of sermons preached in Crown Court. More than half even of the preface is made up out of "Alison, the historian"—a great favourite of Dr. Cumming's—and the French Correspondence of the *Times*. We are rather surprised, by the way, remembering the warm welcome prepared some years ago for Garibaldi—who, however, never came to the Scotch Church to receive it—to be told in the other half that "the revolution really needed is in man's heart, not in man's circumstances," and, still more pointedly, that "the age we live in heaves with judgment. A disloyal democracy has come to the front." As it may rather puzzle the uninitiated to find a prophetic work bearing a title in the past tense, we may explain at once that the "cities of the nations" begin with Babylon and end with Chicago, though there are included in the list Vienna, Munich, and Madrid, which cannot exactly be said to have fallen, except in the sense of falling away from the Pope, who stands forlorn, "surrounded by the cities of the nations, neutral when not hostile, while Bibles and Protestant missionaries are pouring into every part of the Continent of Europe," and apparently with the happiest results. For even the "child of the Austrian peasant may be seen seated in his school reading the Bible in his mother-tongue, and no priest's or prelate's shadow dare come between the eye of that peasant child and the gleaming page that tells him of God and heaven and happiness to come." In short, the fall of the cities is only one of Dr. Cumming's various sobriquets for the fall of the Papacy, and it is satisfactory to know that this "fall from the Pope is a resurrection to Christ."

The thread is not always very easy to follow, but as far as we can understand the author, all the great cities of the ancient world, and most of the modern world, have fallen, and the rest will fall, with the probable exception of London, which is the capital of "a protesting country where freedom finds a home, humanity a champion, and religion the holiest and the purest altar," and where accordingly the sun of Britain may be expected to "shine with advancing splendour, until its beams mingle with the rays of the millennial sun." But when that happy period shall arrive, the author, warned possibly by past experience, vouchsafes no faintest hint. Meanwhile the Pope, under the character of an Arctic bear, is already pretty well disposed of:—

The Pope himself feels he is sinking every day deeper in inextricable ruin.

* *The Cities of the Nations Fell.* By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D., F.R.S.E. London: Hurst & Blackett. 1871.

We read in the pages of a late Arctic traveller that one day a huge mass of ice, on which a bear was seated, broke loose from the mainland and was borne away in a southerly direction. As soon as the bear discovered the situation he howled terribly, rushing about his ice-craft, and appealing for rescue.

The Pope seems to be in a somewhat similar situation. As he nears the light he appeals more loudly to every phantom of a deliverer.

Whether "the light" is that of Protestantism or of extinction is not very clear. But would it not be wiser for prophetic expositors of history to stick to similes and generalities, and eschew the dangerous region of detailed fact? It may be true that in Rome "an enlightened civil law has superseded the sanguinary canon law," though by the way *Ecclesia abhorret a sanguine* is a maxim of the canon law; but it certainly is not true that "the Pope is a subject, not a sovereign," for the civil law expressly guarantees his sovereign rights and dignity. Whether the most convincing evidence of the regeneration of Rome is to be found in the circumstance of two Jews being elected to the Town Council, ten to the Italian Parliament, and two having places in the Cabinet, may be matter of opinion. But when the author goes on to recognise in these exaltations of the chosen people a fulfilment of "the alleluia in Rev. xix." where God is said to have "judged her who did corrupt the earth with her idolatry, and avenged the blood of His servants at her hand," we must take leave to remind him that, so far from their blood being shed, the Jews have usually been kindly treated by the Popes, and by none more than by the present Pontiff. It is hardly necessary to say that the chapter on Rome includes a full Report, quoted from the *Times*' Correspondent, of a memorable little escapade at the Hôtel d'Angleterre last summer, in which we are bidden to recognise a crowning evidence of the downfall of the Papacy.

Our readers will hardly expect us to follow Dr. Cumming through his little summary of events, we mean of extracts, from the fall of Babylon to the conflagration of Chicago; the more so as the first half of the volume will be familiar to all who have a superficial acquaintance with a few popular works of ancient history and modern travels, and the second half to all who have paid due attention to their daily paper for the last six months or so. But we are inclined to wish, in the interests of sound criticism, if not of Christianity, that he would confine himself more rigidly to the interpretation of "frogs" and "vials," and leave to abler hands the delicate task of answering Dr. Colenso and his allies. Perhaps, to such "weak-minded Christians" as are seriously disturbed by a supposed proof of the world being nine thousand instead of six thousand years old, it may be a consolation to know that "two zodiacs on a portico at Dendera" were not really painted till A.D. 147; but we are afraid "scientific inquirers" will hardly consider this disproof of the antiquity of the earth conclusive. Then, again, the objections to the veracity of the Mosaic record, because Joseph is said to have been one hundred and ten years old, hardly seem serious enough to require the solemn asseveration that "the author of this conversed with a Christian gentleman in 1868 who had no bodily ailment whatever, and was in full possession of mental vigour at the age of ninety-seven; and he knows a lady"—whether a Christian lady is not stated—"who has not an ache, whose age is ninety-three." We sincerely trust that "the writer of this" may live to disprove the sceptical intuendo "that the age of one hundred and ten is fabulous," and may be free from aches or other bodily ailment, except—for the sake of future readers—an incapacity to use his pen. But has he met with any Christian ladies or gentlemen who equal the years of Methuselah, or even of Adam? Neither, again, does he appear to us quite happy in his dealings with modern history. It may be true that "there is no future for the Ottoman" as far as the Turkish Empire is concerned; but Dr. Cumming is referring chiefly to the religious future of Mahometanism, and he tells us that "his" (the Mahometan's) "warlike and aggressive spirit is gone," which only betrays his profound ignorance of the subject. The Turk is no longer in a position to offer the old alternative of death or the Koran to a conquered enemy; but Mahometanism as a religious system has certainly not ceased to be "aggressive," and it has not often been more successfully aggressive than in the present day. Its converts during the last few years only are reckoned by millions, and although these are mostly drawn from Buddhist and other Eastern forms of faith, still there are not a few Christians among them. At this moment a considerable Tartar secession from the Russo-Greek Church to Islamism is talked of. There is less room for slips of this kind in describing, "in the words of the *Times*," the fall of Metz and Sedan, and the Paris Commune. It has sometimes puzzled us sorely to understand Dr. Cumming's persistent popularity even with that long-suffering class to whom a wall with "No Popery" chalked on it becomes "a thing of beauty" and "a joy for ever." But we have at last arrived at what seems a satisfactory solution of the mystery, and we believe that in his dexterous use of the scissors lies the secret of his success. To be sure those who have been too busy or too indolent to study their *Times* with proper regularity might make up lost ground more pleasantly, if not more profitably, with the help of an old file of *Guardians* or *Pall Mall Budgets*. But then there is a section of "the religious world" to whom all secular journals, especially on their most leisure day, are common and unclean, but who are by no means exempt from that appetite for news which the Latin Grammar declares to be an instinct of the human mind. To such readers what can be more charming than to have their curiosity gratified in a manner which is not only innocent, but positively devotional; to get, for instance, two

extracts from the newspapers pieced together by such profound and pious meditations as the following:—

Rome—the Rome of Caesar—was once the mistress of the world, the great city that reigned over the kings of the earth.

Successively a kingdom, a republic, a dictatorship, an empire, it carried its victorious arms into remotest lands, and absorbed into itself the nations it subdued. Its "Decline and Fall" is recorded by Gibbon in eloquent words.

Athens, the seat of philosophy, the university of the world, remains; but its ruins are its chief and only material marks of identity.

The poet, gazing on its shattered temples, its moulderings fragments, its half-buried pillars, friezes, altars, and statues, exclaims,

"Shrine of the mighty, can it be
That this is all remains of thee?"

Gaza, Askelon, Ekron, Chorazin, and Bethsaida have ceased to exist, and their sites are scarcely distinguishable.

Our modern cities are not to be exceptions. Elements are working under their foundations that sooner or later, if unarrested, must reduce them to ruins also.

We said before that the original portion of the volume—that is, the portion which is the author's—is chiefly contained in the four chapters or sermons at its close. The first three of these, on the joys of heaven, are scarcely relevant to the general subject, and may be dismissed with the remark once made on a preacher of somewhat similar calibre, by a critic who was anxious not to be disrespectful, that his discourses were "all on the side of virtue and religion." Perhaps one passage, in which the Roman Catholic Church is contrasted with the New Jerusalem, should be excepted as at least in somewhat questionable taste, to say nothing of Christian charity:—

That fell Apostacy which grew out of the corruption of the Gospel, and has rivalled Mahometanism in some of its most iniquitous characteristics, and has made the Crucifix and the Breviary as significant of cruelty and wrong-doing as the Crescent and the Koran—which has substituted blind credulity for enlightened belief—and the decisions of synods for the truths of the Spirit of God, and our relation to the Church for personal union to the Lord; which has taught robbers to say the Apostles' Creed before they sally forth on their mission, and to render thanks to the Virgin Mary over their plunder; which stained the streets of Paris with tears and blood on St. Bartholomew's day, and the stones of Smithfield on earlier occasions; which has made its places of power Aceldamas, and has furnished the materials of the saddest chronicles in the history of nations—shall be cast, like a millstone, into the depths of the sea.

In the concluding discourses we hear that the four elements of national greatness are an open Bible, a faithful Gospel ministry—such, we presume, as is exercised in Crown Court—a sound Scriptural education, which does not exclude from the study of botany "the Rose of Sharon," or from astronomy "the Bright and Morning Star"; and, lastly, a pure worship—that is, a worship without "those things called relics, crosses, crucifixes, images of the Virgin, images of the Saints, images of the Saviour." It is fair to say that the author explains at some length his objection to the crucifix, which is twofold. In the first place, it may happen to be a representation of Judas, or the impenitent thief, rather than of Christ; and, secondly, there are "thoughts, feelings, and sympathies," which neither painting nor statuary can adequately express. It does not seem to have occurred to him that both objections apply not more to images than to pictures of the Redeemer, against which he says not a word, and that the latter would be fatal to, say, a bust of Milton or Shakespeare.

LETTERS OF J. BEETE JUKES.*

TO be a practical geologist was the modest limit which the late Mr. J. Beete Jukes, by his own account, was content to set to his aspirations in the world of science. With no ambition to rank in the high places of creative genius, or to leave a name for some sweeping theory or novel system, the task he set himself was that of working out in detail such problems as in the course of duty he felt himself called upon to face. In the exact and unsparing execution of this task he rendered services to science which, though less showy or popularly talked about, are of more sterling and permanent value than many a brilliant discovery or transcendental hypothesis. The enthusiasm which he took with him into the pursuit of his life made itself manifest in the careful and conscientious certainty which he sought to impart to every step of progress, rather than in the boldness or independence of his advance into the unexplored mysteries of nature. A plain, and in no sense a deeply-grounded or well-tutored man, it was as a faithful worker and diligent pioneer that he has left his mark upon the geological knowledge of his country. The letters and other literary remains which his sister's loving care has brought together in the volume before us set the genuine and unaffected qualities of his nature in a light which attractively displays both his intellect and his heart. The volume, we must say, is needlessly prolix and diffuse. The sense of affection has doubtless overpowered the critical judgment in weighing what was to be omitted or retained. Yet even where too trivial or transient for the interest of the public, every word is characteristic of the man. Though it was unmarked by exceptional or romantic incidents, there is much in his life to serve as a model for youthful aspirants to scientific distinction—a living testimony to what may be done by disciplined and conscientious energy, in the absence of the more showy gifts which at

* Letters and Extracts from the Addresses and Occasional Writings of J. Beete Jukes, M.A., F.R.S., F.G.S., &c. Edited, with Connecting Memorial Notes, by his Sister (C. A. Browne). London: Chapman & Hall. 1871.

times pass for genius. Deprived in his eighth year of his father, one of a succession of well-to-do Birmingham manufacturers, Jukes's early education was of the unsatisfactory kind to be picked up at the Endowed Grammar School of Wolverhampton, where a smattering of classics was imparted by a free use of the cane. Unmarked by any precocity, his boyhood was one of a healthy and happy sort, eager for all youthful games and sports, and especially omnivorous in reading, delighting in books of travel and in objects of nature. His earliest purchase was *Cook's Voyages*. His interest in geology commenced, he himself said, from the first time he saw a boulder stone and wondered how it got there. This early taste was fostered by the study of rich and well-arranged cabinet of Silurian fossils in the possession of an aunt at Birmingham. His systematic devotion to geology awoke under the stirring influence of Professor Sedgwick at Cambridge, where young Jukes matriculated, at St. John's College, in 1830, after a few years at King Edward's School, from which he took with him an exhibition. A fair classic, and passably well grounded in geometry, neither classics nor mathematics had for him the attraction which drew him to the direct study of nature. A half-formed intention of entering the ministry of the Church was laid aside early in his University career. Yet on leaving Cambridge it was no easy matter to decide upon his future course, science opening but few paths to distinction, or even to competence. Too active meanwhile to lead an idle life, he employed himself in lecturing upon his favourite sciences at various towns in the middle and north of England, extending at the same time his knowledge of the geology of each district, and satisfied if his lectures paid his travelling expenses. He delighted in walking, with knapsack and fossil-bag, through wild and lonely places; and made his way, chiefly on foot, to the meeting of the British Association at Newcastle, where he made the acquaintance of many men famous in various departments of science. Having qualified himself during this interval in practical surveying, and made himself known by a geological memoir specially attached to a history of Charnwood Forest, he obtained in 1839 the post of Geological Surveyor to the expedition organized by resolution of the House of Assembly of Newfoundland for a scientific exploration of that island. Upwards of two years and a-half were spent by him in the geological survey and investigation of the mineral resources of Newfoundland, the most important result being the discovery of promising beds of coal. Jukes's official Reports were received with the highest commendation by the colonial authorities, while the more general results of his labours were embodied in his *Excursions in Newfoundland*, published in 1842. His passing impressions, both of the physical features and social characteristics of the colony, are conveyed in a series of letters in the volume before us, conspicuous for good sense, kindly feeling, and exuberant animal spirits, rather than for grace of language or piquancy of observation. With a certain foresight of what was to be his lot in life, he advises any one wishing to live the life of a traveller to begin with that country, "in order to get well accustomed to rough living, rough fare, and rough travel, getting rid of all delicate and fastidious notions of comfort, convenience, and accommodation."

This severe apprenticeship was followed by a delightful cruise, as naturalist, on board H.M.S. *Fly*, during three years' exploration of Torres's Strait, New Guinea, Timor, and the coast of Australia. His descriptions of the novel and luxuriant scenery of the tropics, seen by the keen eye of the scientific observer, while kindling the enthusiasm of the lover of sport, prove his admirable fitness for the post. His prescient glance took in at once the promise of industrial development and boundless fertility of soil which thirty years have since realized in Queensland, though it seems strange that, after twice circumnavigating Australia, the surveying party should have passed by without notice the great river Fitzroy, almost in sight as it is of Port Bowen, the rendezvous of the expedition. It was probably hidden from them by the range of hills which is mentioned as everywhere bounding the river at the distance of ten or fifteen miles from the coast. Java and the Straits Settlements furnish matter for several animated and graphic letters, though, as is the case throughout the volume, they would have been all the better for free and discriminate pruning. Jukes himself would have been the last person to wish his familiar outpourings presented to the world in all their free and unstudied flow, though in the matter of style he was careless enough of the graces of fine writing; and so long as his matter was sound, exact, and well worked out, he would leave his words to find their way in very homely or slipshod attire. After such a rule he seems to have prepared for the public his narrative of the voyage of the *Fly*, and his subsequent *Sketch of the Physical Structure of Australia*. It was not in literary work, but in original observation and generalization of facts, that his real forte lay. Where he is seen at his best is in what forms the second half of his life, his work upon the Geological Surveys of England and Ireland. How literally this was with him a labour of love may be gathered from the letter of Sir H. de la Beche, announcing to his local director, Professor Ramsay, the appointment of a new member of the staff—"Jukes comes at 9s. per diem. He seems to care very little on what terms, so that he comes. Good this."

In October 1846 Jukes met Ramsay and Aveline at Bala, Edward Forbes joining the party as paleontologist, and contracting with Jukes a friendship the depth and warmth of which, short as it was, may be gauged in a measure by the terms in which Jukes speaks of the personal pang mingling with the sense of sorrow on more public grounds, at the loss of that bright spirit. From the Bala beds as a basis he proceeded to trace the homologies or

relations of the general limestone series of Wales, establishing the fact of the great fault which crosses the mountain limestone north of Llangollen, from N.E. by E. to S.W. by W., and passing thence by Corwen and Bala, being posterior in age to the coal formation. He found in this widely extended strike a key to the general aspect or clinal distribution of the country through all later periods. A line of identity was at the same time brought to light between the Wenlock and Bala beds. A general theory of the forces of elevation could thus be inferred. The original strike of the Silurian chain, whether then under water or not, being east and west, it seemed a clear, however novel, hypothesis that this easterly and westerly strike had been obliterated or interfered with by forces producing a cross strike from N.E. to S.W. after the carboniferous deposit. Whatever effects may have been due to denudations, the general lines, or ridges of fracture and undulation, so far from parallel as to be even at right angles to each other, were to be traced as the result of successive sets of elevation and depression. It would have been no slight gain to science had Mr. Jukes enjoyed the advantage of studying this special class of geological phenomena on the grand scale which the mountain-chains and valleys of Switzerland present for observation. As it is, what he effected within the limited area of Wales, chiefly by the keen pursuit and study of "faults," has been of immense service to the geological survey of this country. The several pieces of the geological puzzle, broken and disjointed by the violence of ages, have been sorted and brought once more to their true stratigraphical relations.

That which was the most original, not to say startling, of Jukes's contributions to the science of his day was, we need hardly point out, his theory of the subaqueous origin of coal. With all his energy, and with a power of conviction which grew with years, he combated the views most widely and authoritatively diffused. Heretic as he gloried in knowing himself to be thought, he found to the day of his death proofs forcing themselves upon his mind which upheld him in his single-handed struggle against the world. For his matured and formal views upon the subject, his *Memoir on the South Staffordshire Coal Fields*, and his *Manual of Geology* should of course be consulted. But his letters during the period of its conception and birth set the primary hypothesis itself in a peculiarly interesting light. As early as February 1849 he believes "the stigmariæ of the coal measures to be a subaqueous plant, for which clays (especially what is known as fire-clay) formed the best soil. Fire-clay is often the floor of a bed of coal, though there are many fire-clays without coal, and some coals without fire-clay." The coal must evidently have been tranquilly deposited, as well as the clays, so fine is their texture. All that Jukes thus far contends for is that these facts do not militate against his theory of the drift-origin of coal, or prove it to have been "entirely formed peat-wise by plants growing *in situ*." Some weeks later, in spite of carefully reading Hooker's papers, and Sir H. de la Beche's notes on the coal-beds of South Wales, he rushes at once to the extremity of heterodoxy. "Sinner that I am, I'm not convinced, nor even shaken in my infidelity, as to the terrestrial growth of coal anywhere." He could see no evidence for the growth *in situ* of any other plant than *sigillaria* and *stigmariæ*, which he was by no means persuaded by mere vague relations with *Lycopodiaceæ*, "a desert and arid-plain loving set of plants," to class with any other than subaqueous vegetation. There were many special instances supplied by his favourite study of faults, in which, what in his rough and vehement way, he called the "terrestrial growth and subsidence dodge," seemed to him utterly inapplicable, though they were easily to be explained by the drift theory:—

Take, for instance, the two following bits of sections, which are about half a mile from each other. Now, according to dodge aforesaid, the thick coal subsided at Shut End ten feet, while half a mile off, it went down 130 more; then came the flying red coal at a level, and this time the Shut End part went down eighty-four feet, while the K. Swinfold only descended twenty-nine, to make the level for the Herring coal. See-saw, Margery Daw!

Whatever may be destined to become of Jukes's abstract or speculative opinions, there is no disputing the practical and permanent value of his work upon the Geological Survey. In the gain thence accruing to the mining interest, which he was proud of illustrating in cases without end, it is only fair that he should be credited with his proper share. His transference to the Irish branch of the Survey, though of great service to the scientific and industrial interests of that country, was far from being equally favourable to his own well-being and peace of mind. The responsibility of the directorship weighed heavily upon him. Official obstruction seemed for ever to bar his path, and red-tape to strangle him in its coils. His letters begin to lack their light heart and the enjoyment of work for its own sake. A happy marriage in 1849 brought him encouragement and aid in the work of his later years, and a solace in the trouble and weakness of their close. Unflagging in the discharge of his official duties, he yet found time for valuable correspondence upon questions of physical science at large, upon the political and social state of Ireland, and upon problems in morals, metaphysics, and theology. As a legacy to the geological world he left his solution of what is known as the Devonian question, relating to the classification or grouping of the rocks in North Devon and West Somerset. The key to this difficulty had been found, he was firmly persuaded in the superposition of strata in the south-west of Ireland. Thence he proceeded to urge the practical importance of the survey of the United Kingdom being kept together under one director-general, and in the hands of one body of workers. The

list of works with which the volume before us closes tells its own tale of the energy and industry which Jukes brought to his special department of work. It may serve in part to account for the rapid decline which, in spite of a temporary respite from toil, and a foreign tour in the hopes of reviving his waning health and strength, brought him to rest in the summer of 1869. Conscientious in purpose, straightforward and truthful in word and deed, with a keen eye to the discovery of truth, and a power of will which kept his energies at work up to the highest mark set by an ever-present sense of duty, he has left behind him an example which, not less than his numerous writings, may be prized and studied by those who follow him in the same field of intellectual toil.

CHRISTMAS BOOKS.

II.

WE are unable, we are sorry to say, this year to praise Routledge's *Every Boy's Annual*. The editor apparently was not content with the fairly earned popularity that it had already obtained among young folk by stories which, if somewhat extravagant, were still harmless. He has remarked, no doubt how, in the streets, boys crowd round a window where is exhibited the *Illustrated Police Gazette*, and has thought that, if there is a demand for horrors, he is justified in furnishing a supply. He has accordingly given an utterly revolting picture of a man being eaten up alive by alligators, which are "all leaping up and thrusting out their horrible snouts together, snatching bites of flesh off the unhappy wretch." It is difficult to say which offends more against good feeling and good taste, the artist who exerts all his miserable art to draw such a picture as might haunt a sensitive child for nights, and render a cruel child still more cruel, or the author of the tale who gives the minutest account of a most protracted death.

Old Merry's Annual (Hodder and Stoughton) is not at all open to the charge which we have had to bring against its rival. Its stories seem to be as inoffensive as its illustrations. Its "Monthly Memoranda" give information on new literary publications which will, we trust, be of use in guiding the judgment of its young readers. For instance, in speaking of the *New Sunday School Tune Book*, "Old Merry" says:—"We are prepared to say that a more pleasing, varied, and well-arranged selection it would be hard to find. The words are printed with the tunes, and the copy we have before us, we are glad to see, is marked 'second and enlarged edition.' Get it." We are pleased to notice that Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton, the enterprising publishers of *Old Merry's Annual*, are also so fortunate as to have brought out this "pleasing, varied, and well-arranged selection." We have not yet had an opportunity of seeing it, but we should hope that the *New Sunday School Tune Book* shows its gratitude by containing at least one secular song in praise of "Old Merry."

Among the choicest gift-books of the season must be placed *Raphael of Urbino*, by J. D. Passavant, formerly Director of the Museum at Frankfort (Macmillan). "This work is a translation of those parts of Herr Passavant's volumes which are most likely to interest the general reader." It is most beautifully and profusely illustrated by photographs from the engravings of Raphael's pictures, arranged in chronological order, and accompanied by explanations which are highly interesting though they are minute. We have seen not a few elegant specimens of Mr. Woodbury's new process of photography, but we have seen none that equal those before us. The photograph of the engraving of Pope Julius II. is a triumph of his art, if, where all are excellent, we may specify one in particular.

Illustrations to Goethe's Faust, by Paul Konewka (Sampson Low and Co.). We have never seen anything more expressive and graceful in their way than these silhouette designs. It was wonderfully refreshing to come upon them in their perfect simplicity, after we had been turning over not a small number of illustrations which were certainly ambitious, but too often anything rather than perfect. The designs are accompanied by the English text from Mr. Bayard Taylor's translation.

From Messrs. Triibner and Co. we have another set of silhouette designs by the same artist, under the expressive title of *Schattenbilder*. They are extremely humorous and admirably executed, and equally well fitted to amuse old and young. They are each explained—if explanation is needed—by a simple little poem.

A Boy's Voyage Round the World, edited by Samuel Smiles (Murray). This is not only a boy's voyage, but it is written by a boy, and uncommonly well written too. It was not, of course, written with any view to publication, or else in all probability it would not have been worth reading. Mr. Smiles, in his preface, tells us that his youngest son, when a lad of sixteen, was obliged to make the voyage to Australia in search of health. He kept a log while at sea, and while on land corresponded with relatives at home "regularly and fully." Happily, "he had not the remotest idea that anything which he saw or described during his absence would ever appear in a book." We cannot pretend, of course, to have read the whole of the book, but where we have dipped into it we have found it much more readable and sensible than the average run of books of travels. It is only want of time that has kept us from reading it through. We should be curious to learn how Mr. Smiles had his son taught to write his own language. He cannot, we are sure, have sent him to school, for that is the last place where a boy learns English. If, however, any school

can claim the author of *A Boy's Voyage Round the World*, it has at least as good reason for pride as if it had gained the Balliol scholarship.

From Messrs. Moxon and Co. we have a very convenient edition of *Burns's Poetical Works*, edited with a Critical Memoir, by W. M. Rossetti. The explanations given in the footnotes are short and to the point, and quite sufficient to render it easy for any one unfamiliar with the Northern dialects to enjoy the writings of one who was perhaps the greatest poet that our country saw last century. Mr. Rossetti's Memoir is interesting, though the following passage we cannot pretend to understand:—"Whatever is strongest, deepest, broadest, and finest in that remarkable concrete, the Scotch national character, finds its euthanasia in these immortal verses." Why *euthanasia* at all we cannot even guess; still less when it is the *euthanasia* of certain component parts of concrete.

A Christmas Cake in Four Quarters, by Lady Barker (Macmillan). Lady Barker tells of some lady who was "constantly surrounded by boys and girls in a chronic state of 'story hunger.'" We shrewdly suspect that this lady must be Lady Barker herself, for so good a story-teller, like a newly-opened confectioner's shop, must soon get known to the young people, and have any number of them all around. If, however, any lady finds the boys and girls pressing her too persistently, let her buy this "Christmas Cake" and cast it before them. They will swallow it as eagerly as ever Cerberus did his; and if there is a good fire burning in the hearth, will, like him, stretch themselves on the ground, and digest it quietly and at their leisure.

Besides this "Christmas Cake" we have also from Lady Barker's pen *Travelling About* (Routledge). In this work she gives us a series of short sketches taken from the works of many of the most distinguished modern travellers, in the hope that she may "induce her readers to read the books written by the travellers themselves." Though the charm of a really well-written book of travels consists, in our opinion, in all events its occasional minuteness of details, yet the abridgment is interesting enough. After all, most books of travels unfortunately are not well written, and can stand a great deal of cutting down. For those who will not take the trouble to read them through, we should think Lady Barker's book very well adapted.

From Messrs. Strahan and Co. we have an elegant cabinet edition, in ten volumes, of the *Works of Fancy and Imagination* of Mr. George Macdonald, LL.D., and from Messrs. Routledge a new edition of the *Great Sieges of History*.

Puss and Robin. In pictures by L. Frölich, and in rhymes by Tom Hood (Macmillan). Mr. Tom Hood's rhymes are very dull, and would be enough to raise a mutiny even in a Quaker nursery. A child might possibly consent to listen to the rhymes so long as it had Mr. Frölich's illustrations to look at. The artist, however, does not know how to draw a cat, which is some drawback, as puss appears in most of the pages. We would advise both poet and artist, when they next work in union, to seek a subject more within their powers.

In *Dames of High Estate*, by Madame De Witt (Warne), *Real Folks*, by Mrs. Whitney (Sampson Low and Co.), and the *Oak Staircase*, by M. and C. Lee (Griffith and Farran), we have stories which cannot fail to interest girls, if not their brothers also. *Dames of High Estate* contains four stories, founded on scenes in the history of France. Madame De Witt is, we believe, either the daughter or the granddaughter of M. Guizot, and so has an hereditary claim to deal with history. We should be glad to know, however, the exact part that Miss Yonge has taken in the English version. On the binding we read, in letters of gold, that it is "translated by the Author of the *Heir of Redclyffe*." On the title-page, however, we are more modestly informed, in letters of ink, that "the translations are edited" by the same lady. To the intending purchaser, whether boy or girl, we should be inclined to say "Nimium ne credo colori"—that is, Do not put your trust in the letters of gold. Mrs. Whitney is already well known as the author of *The Gayworthys*. Her *Real Folks* is a clever though oddly written story of the life of American girls, and will be interesting enough to their English cousins. The *Oak Staircase* is an historical story, founded on the Duke of Monmouth's rebellion. It is well written, and being full of incident, will be read with interest.

In *The Household Robinson Crusoe* (Nelson and Sons) we have an excellent reprint of the original edition of that best of all stories. A great many people never read *Robinson Crusoe* as Defoe wrote it, but only an abridgment of it which very early got into circulation. In this abridgment it cannot be said that many of the incidents have been omitted; but, as we have found out by careful comparison, every sentence has been cut down, in the same manner as a reporter treats the speech of some second-rate orator. We must not omit to say that the work before us is not only very well printed, but is also illustrated with simple but effective engravings, and a facsimile of the map of Robinson Crusoe's Island, as published in De Foe's *Serious Reflections*.

Messrs. Routledge and Sons give us a reprint of the Hon. C. A. Murray's novel of the *Prairie Bird*, which will no doubt be as popular with the boys of this generation as it was with their fathers. It would be well, however, if the title-page clearly showed that it is a reprint, for any one might easily imagine that he was buying an original work.

It is to be hoped that *Cassell's Illustrated Almanac* will take the place in many a poor man's home of those miserable prophetic

